BVCKLER OF THE FAITH;

OR,

A DEFENCE OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH OF THE Reformed Churches in France, against the Obiections of M. *Arnoux* the Iesuite.

Wherein all the principall Controuersies betweene *the Reformed Churches and the Church of Rome* are decided.

Written in French by *Peter du Moulin*, Minister of the Word *of God in Paris*; *and now translated into English.*

The third Edition.

LONDON,
Printed by IOHN BEALE for *Nathaniel Newbery*. 1631.

DEFENCE OF THE FAITH

OF

BACKER

TO THE HIGH AND MOST ILLVSTRIOVS PRINCE CHARLES, PRINCE OF WALES, DVKE OF Cornwall, Earle of Chester, &c. Sonne and heire to the most high and mighty King IAMES, King of Great Brittaine, &c.

Most Excellent Prince, I lay at your Highnes feet this Buckler *of the faith, wherein the combats and conflicts of error and truth are liuely set forth: Humbly beseeching your Highnesse, that as I haue made it for the defence of that cause which your Highnesse maintaineth; so it may be vpheld by your Princely authority. Your vertue which exceedes your yeeres, maketh you a fit Iudge of these matters; and your Princely affabilitie (whereof I haue had experience) encourageth mee to haue accesse vnto you. Besides, I could not better adorne and beautifie the Frontispice of this my worke, then by prefixing to it the name of so great a Prince; who being now nursed by*

the Church, shall one day bee a mighty Father thereof; who having sucked Piety from his mothers breasts, and following the steps of his Royall father, to frame himselfe to vertue, hath no need of any other examples then domesticall; Being the sonne of a great Prince, whose actions are rules, and his words wise instructions; Whose zeale not being confined within the limits of his owne Kingdomes, produceth noble effects in forreine Countries. From whose mouth (most noble Prince) you have learned, how difficult a matter it is to Command; How hee whom God hath favoured and advanced above all, hath so much the greater account to render unto him; How it is a thing worthy double commendation in a Prince, to obey the will of God, because he hath more meanes to fulfill his owne; How hard a thing it is to procure to so many persons rest by his travell, and secure repose by his vigilancie; How necessary it is for him to have about him vertuous persons, whose eyes and eares he may make use of, lest peradventure otherwise he come last to know the truth; How carefully he ought to guide his actions, sith they are exposed to the view of so many millions, and subiect to every ones construction; How his Wisedome ought to be armed with Courage, because a vertuous Prince must make

accounte

account to haue the Diuell his enemy. These holy Instructions (most noble Prince) which are familiar vnto you, together with the gifts of Nature, wherewith God hath aboundantly adorned you, call you to great matters, and promise great effects, and fill with great hopes the hearts of all those that feare God who esteeme you as a Plant which God hath planted, which he dressed with his owne hand, which hee watereth with his grace, and will one day make fructifie to his glorie. For my part sith I can adde nothing to your praise, I will offer my vowes to God for your prosperity; hoping that your Highnesse will fauourably accept of my affection, and esteeme me to bee your Highnesse

most humble and most
obedient seruant,

Peter du Moulin.

An Aduertiſement to the Reader.

CHriſtian Reader, may it pleaſe thee to vnderſtand, that when two ſundry Editions of this worke had ſpeedily beene ſet forth in French, the Author was aduertized that ſome in the Church of England diſliked ſomewhat in it; whereupon he reuiewed it all againe, purpoſing to explaine himſelfe in that manner in the next Edition, as ſhould giue full ſatisfaction. But before that could conueniently be ſet forth, hauing notice of my intention to publiſh his worke in Engliſh, he ſent me the copie, wherein ſome things he ommitted, a few paſſages he ſomewhat altered with his owne pen. In one place hee inſerted two whole leaues, viz. in the 124. * Section, wherein at large hee ſetteth downe his iudgement touching Epiſcopall authoritie, and the diſcipline of the Church of England. a Thus much I thought to acquaint thee withall beforehand, that thou mightest not giue leſſe credit to this Engliſh copie, though it ſomewhat vary from the French already publiſhed; for nothing is herein added, omitted, or altered, but by direction from the Author himſelfe, who hath promiſed that the next French Edition ſhall be ſet forth with the like corrections and additions. In the meane while enioy this, and accept it with the ſame mind with which it is tendred vnto thee. Farewell.

* Pag. 345. beginning at line 10 and continuing vnto pag 343.

THE

THE PREFACE TO THOSE OF THE CHVRCH OF ROME.

SIRS, that which I intend at this time to offer vnto you, it may bee, would bee better accepted, if it were tendred vnto you by another hand: howbeit I dare boldly affirme, that neuer any ſpake vnto you, that was either more voyde of hatred, or more deſirous of your good and ſaluation. The Word of God, whereupon wee ground our Religion, commandeth vs to loue thoſe that hate vs; and to beleeue that thoſe which haue perſecuted vs, haue thought that in ſo doing they haue done God good ſeruice. Euery man that ſeeketh the truth, ought to bee thus affected, without which it is impoſſible to reape any fruit by our communication: for no wound will euer bee healed, as long as the inflammation continues. And as in an houſe that burneth, thoſe that ſpeake are not vnderſtood, by reaſon of the noiſe and cries of thoſe that gather about it: ſo wee ſhall neuer vnderſtand one the other, as long as our minds are inflamed with hatred and rancour. The ſtudie of ſacred truth requireth a peaceable ſpirit, which deliberately weigheth things, without carping at the perſons.

sons. For what reason haue wee to hate any man because he erreth, or because wee thinke we see clearer then he doth?

Now as blind men commonly are mutinous & cholericke, so those men are most violent that haue least vnderstanding: so that hee that will take vpon him to remedy this ignorãce, must seeke to pacify their rage. But there is no hope of remedy in him who studieth to be ignorant, and feareth to know the Will of God, lest he should be obliged to follow it. Such is the maladie of this age, wherein the people make profession to follow without knowledge; and to beleeue the Church, not knowing what the Church ought to beleeue: & relie vpon the faith of another, not knowing the rule of faith, which is the word of God. As if those that are our pastors and guides, ought to bee our warrant before the Iudgement seate of God, or as if it were a vertue to beleeue in God by an atturney.

It is true indeed that the people ought to obey their guides, prouided God be their guide, and to beleeue that which they teach, so that which they teach bee drawn from the Word of God. The which if they hide from the people, and hinder them from the reading thereof, it is an euident signe either that they feele themselues culpable, or that in stead of submitting thẽselues vnto this rule, they would haue their authority to be the supreme rule. For why should the Word of God contained in the holy Scriptures, be suspected by vs to be a dangerous book? Why should children be forbidden to looke into their fathers testament? S.

Index librorum prohibitorum cum regula confectis per patres à Tridentina Synodo delectos. Regula 4. Cùm experimento manifestum sit, si sacra Biblia vulgari linguâ passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quàm vtilitatis oriri: Quid absque vlli facultate ea legere seu habere præsumpserit, nisi prius Bibliis ordinario redditis, peccatorũ absolutionem percipere non possit. Where you must note, that there it is spoken of Bibles translated by Catholicke Romane authors.

Paul the Apoſtle wrote his Epiſtles to the people of Rome, Corinth, and Epheſus, to the end that they might reade them: why then ſhould Chriſtians in theſe dayes bee depriued of the reading of them? The Catholicke Epiſtles of Saint *Iames*, Saint *Peter*, and Saint *John*, are written to all the faithfull in generall: why then ſhould not Chriſtian people reade thoſe letters that are expreſly addreſſed vnto them, and written for their inſtruction? Why ſhould not a Chriſtian reade the writings of the Prophets, as well as they of Berœa did, who hauing beene at Saint *Pauls* preaching, went and conferred his doctrine with the Scriptures? To what end is it to alledge places of the holy Scriptures in our Sermons, if the Auditory be not permitted to examine whether they haue bene faithfully and truely alledged? It is a moſt horrible thing, that in thoſe countries where the Inquiſition reigneth, it ſhould be a crime deſeruing burning, to haue a Bible in the vulgar tongue, and in the meane time not onely the reading of friuolous fables is tolerated, but whoredome alſo by the law and publicke authoritie is eſtabliſhed and permitted. And if it bee the tranſlation that diſpleaſeth his Holineſſe, at leaſt hee ought to take order that there ſhould be one done according to his minde.

To ſay that ſome men abuſe the reading thereof, is as much as to accuſe the Apoſtles of want of diſcretion, for hauing written their Epiſtles to Chriſtian people, without foreſeeing that they might abuſe them. By the ſame reaſon preaching likewiſe ſhould be prohibited, becauſe many abuſe it. Men abuſe euen the bounty and goodneſſe of God. And if we muſt haue ſpeciall leaue to reade the holy Scriptures, is it not a

miſerable

miſerable caſe, that we may not obey God without licence? & that God can haue no ſeruants without the Pope of Romes permiſſion? Or if they ſay, that it is not conuenient nor fit that ignorant people ſhould reade them; I anſwer, that all men are ignorant in religion, before they haue read them; and that, without impiety, a man cannot haue knowledge in religion without the Scriptures.

Therefore let me intreate you to ſhake off this ſcrupuloſitie, whereby God is wronged: as if his Word were contagious, and a net ſpred abroad to intangle the conſciences of weake Chriſtians; leſt that prophecie be accompliſhed in you, which is pronounced by the Prophet *Eſay*, ſaying, *Therfore my people are gone into captiuitie, becauſe they haue no knowledge*; and that ſaying of our Sauiour Chriſt, *Ye are deceiued, not knowing the Scriptures*. Suffer not this precious treaſure, nor this contract of our ſpirituall marriage with the Sonne of God, to be pulled out of your hands. Suſpect thoſe who during the night of ignorance, hide this celeſtiall light, and in the meane time light and ſet vp candles at noone day. Neuer hope to be ſaued by the faith of other men: for God ſaith, that *The iuſt ſhall liue by his faith*; and that *If the blind leade the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch*.

Eſay 5. 13.
Matth. 22. 29.
Habac. 2. 4.
Matth. 15. 14

Now to make you know, that the Scripture is taken away from you, not to keepe you within the bounds of ſobriety, but to detaine you in ignorance, conſider that in the Church of Rome they reade certaine Chapters of the holy Scriptures openly vnto you in a language which you vnderſtand not. If in thoſe Chapters men ſpake vnto God, it might for an excuſe be alledged, that God vnderſtandeth all languages: but

thoſe

thoſe Chapters are diuine inſtructions, wherein God ſpeaketh vnto men. Tell me in conſcience, why ſhould God be as it were a Barbarian vnto vs, ſpeaking vnto vs in an vnknowne tongue? Why doth he ſpeake vnto men, but becauſe he would haue them to vnderſtand him? Why are thoſe things which otherwiſe would be held to be ridiculous & contrary to common ſence, in religion eſteemed to be good and conuenient? Is it not rather an intention of the enemy of our ſaluation, by that meanes to expoſe Chriſtianity to an open ſcorne, and to hinder the Word of God from being vnderſtood by vs? to the end alſo that the threatning pronounced by God vnto thoſe people with whom he is angry, might be accompliſhed, ſaying, *By men of other langnages will I ſpeake vnto this people, and yet will they not heare me.* 1. Cor. 14. 21.

This miſchiefe hath produced another; for in taking the holy Scriptures from you, which is the booke that maketh men wiſe, they haue giuen you images, which are termed the bookes of the ignorant, becauſe by them ignorance is maintained. By them the people is abuſed, in ſtead of being taught the truth. In ſtead of inſtruction, they giue them recreation. But becauſe the ſecond Cõmandement of the Law of God is againſt it, which concerning the Seruice of God, forbiddeth vs to make any grauen images, and to worſhip or fall downe before any thing that is in heauen aboue, or in the earth beneath: and that this law pronounced with thunder and lightening, thundreth yet againſt this ſuperſtition, theſe Doctors haue impoſed ſilence to the Law of God, and haue beene ſo bold as to raze this commandement out of the Houres of the Virgin *Mary*, and Seruice-bookes which they giue

giue you leaue to reade: which makes vs wholly to ſuſpect them. And it is a thing hardly to be thought or beleeued, that poore litle wormes of the earth dare be ſo bold, as to correct that Law which God pronounced with his owne mouth: yea the ſame Law whereby at the latter day they ſhall be iudged.

For theſe practices the holy and ſacred name of the Church ſerueth for a couer. They ſay, that the Church cannot erre: that ſhee is the ſoueraigne Iudge of the points and doubts of faith: and that ſhe is an infallible Interpreter of the Scriptures. By which Church, they vnderſtand neither the Grecian, Syrian, nor African, (although much ancienter & purer then the Romane) but onely the Romane Church: which hauing neuer bene other then a particular Church, is ſaid to be the vniuerſall Church; and by this meanes, the Church of Rome is become a Iudge in her owne cauſe. The Greek Church (much ancienter then the Romane) complaineth that the Church of Rome hath reuolted and ſeparated it ſelfe from her, producing againſt her, her chaires, her ſucceſſion, and her antiquity. In this controuerſie, the Church of Rome boaſteth to be Iudge, and ſo will be both Iudge and partie. And in the queſtion, whether the Church of Rome cannot erre, ſhee her ſelfe will be Iudge: and which is more, when queſtion is made to decide what the dutie of the Church is, the Church of Rome will be the ſoueraigne Iudge, that ſhee may haue no other Law then that which ſhe will eſtabliſh, and which ſhe propoundeth to her ſelfe. And when any argument is moued concerning the ſence and Interpretation of the Law of God, ſhe ſaith, ſhe is the infallible Interpreter thereof, and will haue her interpretations to be held to be of equal authority

with

vnchaine Law of God. And yet it is certaine, that at the latter day she shall be iudged by that Law. There is no absurdity more palpable, then to make sinfull men, & fallible Iudges of the sence of that law by which the *it* sins ought to be iudged. What obedience, thinke you, is the soueraigne Master of all creatures to expect, if his seruants might presume to say vnto him, It is true that thou hast commanded vs to obserue such a law, but we interprete the same otherwise, and iudge that thy commandement ought thus to be vnderstood; and shou know'st that we are infallible Iudges in such matters, and that our interpretations are of equall authority with thy commandement? After this manner it were better to be a seruant then a master. By which of these two wayes, thinke you, ought the Prelates of the Church to be iudged at the latter day; whether by the Law of God, or by their owne interpretations? Herein I make all men Iudges that haue any sparke of common sense, or any free iudgement without preiudicate opinion in them; whether God gouerning & teaching the Church by his word, or the Church which ought to receiue this word and yeeld obedience vnto him, ought rather to be soueraigne Iudge in religion? And which should rather be Iudge, either the Scripture that commands that there shall be a Church, and propounds and proscribes lawes thereunto, or the Church which onely testifieth the same to be the Scripture? specially seeing that this testimony may be giuen by a corrupt and disobedient Church to the Scripture? Which shal rather be Iudge, the Scripture that is one, and which iudgeth without passion, or the Church which is diuided into diuers cõtrary Churches, which cannot be assembled together, & whereof the Pastors

are

are subiect to be ambitious, and addicted to couetousnes, and that ought to be suspected Iudges, when they onely seeke their owne profit and authority.

Here I can easily, as it were with a finger, point out and shew vnto you, that you are led and guided in a way wherein it is impossible for you to be saued. For you are taught simply to beleeue in the Church of Rome, and without other enquiry, wholly to depend vpon the authority thereof. And yet neuertheleſſe, you are depriued of all meanes whereby to know and find out, whether this Church wherein you beleeue, is pure, and teacheth true doctrine. For how should you know it? Is it by the holy Scriptures? But that booke you are not permitted to reade. At Rome and in Spaine, to reade it is burning. Will you know it by antiquity? But they are Greeke and Latin books, which the people vnderstand not. What knowes an artificer, a woman, or labourer among you, whether his Church teacheth according to the Scriptures? or whether his Church be the same now that it was twelue or fifteene hundred yeeres agoe? or whether in a great role of Popes set downe in a paper, the first of them beleeued as the latter do; and whether time hath wrought no alteration therein? To be short, you haue no other proofe for the purity of your Church, but onely the testimony of your Church it selfe, the Prelates whereof boast that they cannot erre, and in the meane time they bereaue you of all meanes of discerning error from truth, by hiding from you the rule of truth, which is the holy Scriptures. But why should the Church of Rome rather haue this perfection, then the Greeke or Syrian Churches, farre ancienter and purer then the Church of Rome, founded by Iesus Christ himselfe

himselfe and by his Apostles, and which also affirme that they haue Saint *Peters* chaire? Doth the Scripture attribute any prerogatiue aboue others to the Romane Church? or doth it giue her the priuiledge not to erre?

From all this, there follow two things that are as cleare as the Sunne in noone-day; the one, that your faith is grounded onely vpon the authoritie of men, and by consequence, that your religion is humane, and not diuine. Whosoeuer saith, I beleeue the Gospel and the Word of God, because the Church cõmandeth it, giueth more credit to the Church then to God. To doubt of Gods truth, is a lesse crime then to make it to depend vpon men. The other, that of all humane testimonies you ground vpon the worst and most vncertaine: for you beleeue that your Church is good, because shee saith so, and make her Iudge in her owne cause not once considering, that by this word Church, you vnderstand not the Christian people, nor all Pastors in generall, but the Pope & a few Prelates, whose rules are called the Rules of the Church, although they tend wholly to the profit of the Clergie, and to aduance the Empire of the Bishop of Rome. And will you alwayes hold your soules, created by God according to his Image, and which he hath redeemed by the bloud of his Sonne, in this miserable captiuitie? Will you draw and heape the wrath and indignation of God vpon your heads, by reiecting the saluation which is offered vnto you?

I confesse that the Church of Rome in certaine points alledgeth the Scriptures; and that betweene vs and her there is great contention touching the interpretation thereof: but we vse the Scriptures in other

manner

Scriptures: and we subiect them to none.

2. They perswade you that the Scriptures are obscure and ambiguous: but we say that all things necessary to saluation are therein contained, and may be from thence clearely deduced.

3. They say, that the Scriptures are an imperfect rule, and will haue another vnwritten rule, and traditions of the Church, which they equall in authoritie with the Scriptures. We on the contrary say, that the holy Scriptures are able to make vs wise vnto saluation, and that we ought not to presume aboue that which is written: & that in those things wch are cleare and manifest in the Scriptures and need no interpretation, all doctrines necessary to saluation are contained.

2. Tim. 3. 15. 1. Cor. 4. 6.

4. Also when wee alledge the Scriptures, we alledge them as the soueraigne Iudge, and as that which gouerneth the Church, and giues her her authority. But the Church of Rome alledgeth the Scriptures as a doctrine authorized by the Church, and saith, that we must receiue them, because the Church hath so ordained it.

5. And when we interpret the Scriptures, we giue not our interpretations for lawes, as the Church of Rome doth, neither do we make our selues Iudges and infallible interpreters of the holy Scriptures.

6. Lastly, when we interpret the Scriptures, wee draw our interpretations from the Scriptures themselues. But the Church of Rome drawes her interpretations from the vnwritten word and traditions. As for example, we expound these words, *This is my body*, by these words, *The bread which I giue you, is the communion*

He tooke bread & gaue it, Do this in remembrance of me.

ration of my body; which exposition is found in the text it selfe, touching the institutiō of the Sacrament: or by these words of the Apostle, *The bread which we breake, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* But your Doctors do not interpret the Scriptures so: for they draw their interpretations from the vnwritten word, and from Traditions. When the Lord said to *Peter*, *I haue prayed that thy faith may not faile*; they say that by those words the vertue not to erre was promised to Saint *Peter*, and to the Popes of Rome his successors. But the Scripture speaketh not of Popes, nor of Bishops of Rome, nor giueth any successor to Saint *Peter* in his Apostolicall place. In like sort there is mention in *Malachi* of a pure oblation that should be offered in all places. This oblation, according to the interpretations of the Romish Doctors, is the Masse, wherein they say, that the body of our Lord is really sacrificed. But this interpretation is taken out of the vnwritten word: for the holy Scripture speaketh not of the Masse, neither commandeth vs to sacrifice the body of Iesus Christ, nor establisheth Priests in the Church to sacrifice the Sonne of God. And so when the Scripture saith, *Thou shalt worship one onely God, and him only shalt thou serue*: the Romish Doctors interpret it, that God onely forbiddeth the adoration of *Latria*, but not of *Dulia*, which is an inferiour religious seruice, but the Scriptures make no mention of the adoration of *Dulia*, nor of any other religious seruice, but only of that which is due vnto God. These are interpretations which the Romish Church drawes from the vnwrittē word, which is referred to the discretiō of the Church of Rome, and cannot be learned but from her mouth. For I am of opinion, that neuer any man saw all the

1. Cor. 10. 16.

Mal. 1. 11.

doctrines of the vnwritten word draw me into one bodie, because that would alter and change with times and seasons, and is accordingly ordered to the times, and that still the Church of Rome hath power to adde new articles thereunto, and namely touching the points of faith.

Bellar. in Bark. cap. 3. Non refellit de Ecclesia Christi sentit, qui nihil admittit, nisi quod expresse in veteri Ecclesia sumptum aut factum esse legit: quasi Ecclesia posteriorum temporis, aut deserit esse Ecclesia, aut facultatem non habeat explicandi & declarandi, constituendi, etiam & imbendi, quæ ad fidem & mores Christianorum pertinent.

The greatest mischiefe is, that these traditions and doctrines of the vnwritten word, are not onely additions to the Scriptures, but manifest contradictions: whereof the Masse alone shewth many examples.

1. For Iesus Christ ministring the Sacrament of the Eucharist, spake in a tongue vnderstood by the assistants: but the Priest in the Masse speaks in a tongue not vnderstood by the people.

2. Iesus Christ communicated to all the assistants: but the Priest of his owne receiveth and drinketh alone.

3. Iesus Christ giveth the cup to all men, and will have all to drink thereof: but the Priest drinketh alone, and denieth the cup to the people.

4. Iesus Christ offered nothing vnto God: but the Priest in the Masse prayeth God to accept his oblation of Christ.

5. Iesus Christ lifted vp no hoast: but the Priest lifteth vp an hoast to be adored.

6. In the institution of this holy Sacrament, there is no mention made of a sacrifice, nor to sacrifice the body of Iesus Christ: on the contrary, the Priest pretendeth to sacrifice the body of Iesus Christ in a reall and propitiatory sacrifice for the quicke and the dead.

7. In the institution of this Sacrament, there was no adoration of the hoast, but all the Apostles sate at the table: on the contrary, the Priest causeth the hoast to be adored. He that at this day should do as the Apostles

thes did, should be held and esteemed to be prophane and hereticke.

10. There were no relickes hidden vnder the Lords table, nor bones of any of the Patriarks or Prophets: on the contrary, vnder the stones of the altar there are bodies of the dead, without which relicks an altar cannot be consecrated: and the Priest in the Masse asketh mercy and forgiuenesse of his sinnes for the merits of the Saints, whose bones are hidden vnder the altar.

Oramus te Domine per merita Sanctorum, quorum reliquiæ hic sunt, & omnium Sanctorum, vt indulgere dignéris omnia peccata mea.

9. The Gospell witnesseth, that Iesus Christ giuing bread vnto his disciples, said, it was his body: on the contrary, the Priest saith, that the bread is not the body of Iesus Christ, but that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Iesus Christ.

10. Iesus Christ witnesseth, that it was the fruite of the vine which he dranke: but the Priest denieth that it is the fruite of the vine.

11. Iesus Christ will haue vs to do it in remembrance of him: but the Priest pretendeth to make Christ himselfe.

12. Saint *Paul* in foure places saith, that we breake and eate bread: on the contrary, the priest maintaineth that we neither breake nor eate bread.

13. The Lord instituted a Sacrament, but the Priest celebrateth a Sacrifice. In a word, the one celebrated the holy Supper, the other singeth Masse, expressly made to disfigure the holy Supper of the Lord.

The Romish Doctors thinke to defend their cause by vsing a childish recrimination, & obiecting against vs, that seeing we will needs follow our Lord Iesus Christ, we ought to celebrate the holy Sacrament after supper, in a high chamber and admit no women vnto it: Iesus neither the place, nor the houre, nor the sexe

of the assistants, are of the essence or any part of the action; and without them the action is still entire and therein Iesus Christ neither prescribed any rule, nor made any prohibition. But the change and alteration which we obiect against them, is in essential things, and such as change the nature of the action: seeing that therby an adoration is induced, which was neuer commanded, nor yet practised by the Apostles: a sacrifice established which the Lord did not appoint: a superstition touching dead mens bones authorized: a common repast changed into a priuate Masse: and the people depriued of the vnderstanding of the ordinary Seruice; taught to take God in their hands, to eate their Creator, to adore the Creature, and are depriued of halfe the Sacrament, that is, of the cup, whereof Christ said, *Drinke ye all of this*; as the Apostle also commandeth the people of Corinth to take the cup as well as the bread. Wherein we propound a way and meanes for vs to agree one with another, which cannot be refused but by him that loueth discord, that hath no Christian bloud in him, or that striueth against God. For euery Christian confesseth, that Iesus Christ did well, and that there is no exception to be taken against his institution. And although it were lawfull to celebrate the Supper in other manner then he did it, yet all men grant that it should not be ill done to follow his example, to speake as he spake, and to do as he did. This is it that we require. And it is certaine, that the Pope might end all the controuersies growne and raised vpon this point, which trouble and make a diuision in Christendome, if he would reduce the holy Supper into the forme wherein the Lord did celebrate it, laying aside all disputations, and bind the people to the example

1. Cor. 11. 28. Let a man examine himselfe, and so eate of this bread, and drinke of this cup.

of

of the Sonne of God. What discõmodities or inconueniences soeuer might be alledged to the contrary, they cannot equalize nor counterballance the obedience that we owe to Iesus Christ, the peace of Christendome, nor the reunion of this rupture and separation of the people, which hath been the cause of so many troubles, and hath shed so much bloud, and which openeth the sides of the Church of Rome, as well as it doth ours, exposing the same to the violence of Turks and Infidels.

All indifferent persons will easily confesse and acknowledge that this is truth; but fearing that your consciences should be touched therewith, they vse an artificiall meanes to represent our religion vnto you in other manner then it is, & paint it out before you like a terrible monster, making vs to speak and teach those things which are altogether contrary to our beliefe and confession: and withall, diuers of you are so light of credit, and so easly carried away, that you rather desire to learne and vnderstand what our religion is by the inuectiues of our enemies, then by our owne confession. And although we haue protested, that we beleeue nothing of all that which they impose vpon vs, yet they will constantly perswade vs, that we beleeue that which we beleeue not. Wherein against their wils they iustifie vs. For thereby they secretly confesse, that our religion being truly set down, cãnot be represſed: & that if it were liuely described, it would at the first make a strong impression in the spirits & hearts of the auditors by the euidence of the truth thereof. They tell you,

1. That our religion teacheth, that good works are not necessary.

2. That the elect may commit sinne, and liue wickedly without danger.

3. That God rewardeth not good workes.

4. That God constraineth our wils, and forcibly draweth them to goodnesse.

5. That we accuse and blame God to be vniust, as hauing propounded a Law vnto vs which we cannot fulfill.

6. That we are enemies to the Saints and to the virgin *Marie*.

7. That to vnderstand the Scriptures, euery one of vs boasteth that wee haue a particular inspiration giuen vnto vs.

8. And that we deny the omnipotent Power of God in the Eucharist.

All this is false, and contrary to our beliefe.

1. Our religion teacheth, that good workes are necessary to saluation. For men go not into heauen by the way of hell, nor to the Kingdome of God by seruing the diuell.

2. Our religion teacheth, that those that are predestinated to saluatiō, are also predestinated to liue holy. To say, I may boldly liue wickedly, because I am predestinated to saluation, is the speech of a reprobate, that will be wicked because God is good, and that maketh Gods Grace, which is a prouocation and a goade to pricke vs forward to vertue, a pillow to lull him asleepe in vice.

3. Our religion beleeueth, that God rewardeth good workes, but of his free mercie, without desert.

4. It beleeueth that God constraineth not mens wils, but boweth them, and causeth them willingly to addict their minds to goodnesse.

5. It doth not esteeme it a thing vniust, that God requireth that of man which he cannot do, when man is bound to do it, and that his weakneſſe or want of abilitie proceedeth from himſelfe.

6. It honoureth the Saints, as the ſame Saints did honour thoſe Saints that were before them.

7. For the vnderſtanding of the Scriptures, it contenteth it ſelfe with that which therein is clearely and euidently ſet downe; and leaueth particular inſpirations to mad and fantaſticall perſons.

8. It denieth not the omnipotent Power of God in the Euchariſt, but ruleth it ſelfe according to his will. It vſeth the holy Sacrament, not to make Ieſus Chriſt, but to honour him; not to make his body to deſcend downe vnto vs, but to eleuate and lift vp our hearts vnto him. It taketh not vpon her to take God in this life, but is content that God would be pleaſed to take vs vp into heauen when we die. She is not afraid that God can fall, be ſtolen, carried away by a mouſe, or eaten by his enemies. She beleeueth not that the Sonne of God and the diuell both entred into *Iudas* together at one time; nor that Ieſus Chriſt did eate himſelf, ſeeing it was not neceſſary for our redemptiō.

Our religion is a religion that acknowledgeth no other head of the Church but Ieſus Chriſt, no other rule of faith then his Word, no propitiatory ſacrifice but his death, no other purgatory but his bloud, nor other merits, but his obedience.

It is a religion, that will haue the people to read the Word of God, becauſe ſhee is not afraid that men therein ſhall find their condemnation, which ſpeaketh in a knowne language, becauſe ſhe is not aſhamed of her beliefe.

Iris a religion, which teacheth fasting to consist in abstinence from meate, and not in distinction of meates. She fasteth for exercise of humilitie, and not with opinion of merit or satisfaction: shee borroweth not other mens satisfactions, but with the Apostle beleeueth, that euery man shall beare his owne burthen. Galat. 6. 5.

It is a religion, which distrusting in her owne works, trusteth in the promises of God: which preacheth hope and affiance, and not to doubt of her saluation: which recõmendeth an humble assurance, and not an arrogant perplexitie, by the which those that display or boast of their owne merits, make profession to doubt of their saluation.

It is a religion, wherein men confesse and acknowledge that they haue often done that which God forbiddeth to be done, farre from hauing done more then he commandeth to be done: and is so farre from doing supersbundant workes, that it faileth in doing that which is necessarie to be done. It pretendeth not to make God debtor to man by works of supererogation, but confesseth man to be a sinner before God, because of his disobedience.

It is a religion, which in stead of framing and fashioning stones like vnto the image of man, seeketh by all meanes possible to reforme man according to the image of God: which in stead of worshipping a crosse of wood, adoreth Christ crucified, trusteth in his passion, and glorieth in his ignominy.

It is a religion, which beleeueth not that God wᵗ gaue his Sonne to die to saue his enemies, taketh pleasure to torment the soules of his children in a fire of Purgatory, and to punish them for sinnes already pardoned,

doned, and for the which Iesus Christ hath made full satisfaction, by punishments which serue not to amend the sinner, but to satisfie the Iustice of God.

It is a religion, which maketh not her prayers by number, neither maketh the efficacy of prayer to consist in the often repetition of the same prayer, but in faith and the disposition of the heart.

It is a religion, which holdeth that faith consisteth not in ignorance, but in knowledge: which equally administreth holy things as well to the rich as to the poore; not as in the Romish Church, where dispensations and absolutions are sold, and particular Masses are neuer said but for them that first giue something to the Priest.

To be short, it is a religion which hath little outward shew and glory, but much inward comfort, constancy and perseuerance, which will be knowne by the effects, and ordaineth few ceremonies, but ministreth many instructions.

You make answer to this, and say, that these are new things. How esteeme you them to be new, seeing that Iesus Christ himselfe & his Apostles taught in that maner? It is true, that they are new to those that are nourished in an inueterat error. Healing is newer then the disease: but we must alwaies ascend vp to the spring of truth, in regard wherof all old errors are new. No man euer opposed himselfe against an accustomed rooted error, but he was accused of nouelty. But this reproach of noueltie ill becõmeth the mouthes of those persons which hide the true antiquitie from the people, wch is the Word of God, & which maintaine, that yet at this day the Church may and can make new ordinances touching faith; and which by the Church vnderstand

no

no other then the Romish Church; that in the first ages after the Apostles cannot produce one man that was of their religion; and which know that in all antiquitie there is no mention made of excluding the people from the Cup, of prohibiting them the reading of the holy Scriptures, of reading the Scriptures to the people in a language which they vnderstand not, of painting the Trinitie, of worshipping Images, of adoring the hoast with the worship of *Latria*, of private Masses, of the Bishop of Romes Court, of his Indulgences, of the treasure of the Church, of his power to depose Kings, and of drawing soules out of Purgatory, nor of many other corruptions which are beautified and set forth with the fraudulent title of Apostolicall traditions, as if they came from the Apostles themselues.

Those same men that boast and brag of Antiquitie, are they that rudely handle the ancient Doctors, and censure and condemne them at their pleasure: that will haue the Fathers to be interpreters of the Scriptures, so that they themselues may be interpreters of the Fathers, and Iudges of Antiquitie: and that not onely condemne euery particular Father, but also whole Councels wherein the Fathers generally spake all together. Three vniuersall Councels condemned *Honorius* Bishop of Rome to be an hereticke, but at this day they reiect those Councels. At the first Councell of Constantinople, *anno* 381. there were 150. orthodox Bishops, and 630. at the Councell of Chalcedon holden *anno* 451. and yet neither that great number, nor the great antiquity hindreth our aduersaries from condemning all those Fathers for making the Bishop of Constantinople equal with the Bishop of Rome in Ecclesiasticall

Cotton in the Preface of his Cath. Institut. speaketh thus of those two vniuersall Councels, saying, Grecia began an. 380. to draw on to rebellion against the holy seate, & to traueise the authority

cleſiaſticall things. The Councell of Conſtance holden *anno* 1416. acknowledgeth that in the primitiue Church the faithfull receiued the Sacrament vnder both kinds, & neuertheleſſe ordaineth that thoſe that would follow the ancient cuſtome, ſhould be holden and eſteemed to be hereticks, and grieuouſly puniſhed. of the Biſhop of Rome, appointing the Biſhop of Conſtantinople to be his equall. After that, an. 450. they ſaid, that they had the ſame priuiledges.

And it is a wonder how theſe men dare ſpeake of Councels, when they know very well, that day is not more contrary to night, then ancient Councels are contrary to the new, wherein the Pope ruleth all, and ordaineth all, the other Biſhops only giuing their conſents, by bowing their heads in ſigne of approbation; at the entring into which Councels, the holy Bible is laid at the Popes feet, to witneſſe that the Word of God is ſubiect vnto him; where the Pope is ſet in an high throne, & the Emperour below at his feet. To be ſhort, we ſee by the practices of the latter Councels, ſpecially the Councell of Florence, the laſt of Lateran, and by the booke of ſacred Ceremonies, that a Councell for certaine ages paſt, is nothing elſe but a Papall Conſiſtorie, but held with more ſolemnitie: whereas in the ancient Councels the Biſhop of Rome durſt not perſonally appeare, & his ordinary Deputies therein had neither preſidence nor authority: which is farre from ordaining, *that no booke ſhall be Canonicall without the Popes authoritie*; and that *all Kings muſt kiſſe his feete*: and to declare, that *there is no other name vnder the heauens, but that of the Pope*: which are the decrees and ordinances of the Councell of Rome vnder *Gregory* the ſeuenth, *anno* 1076. *Annal. Baron. an.* 1076.

To conclude, it is moſt certaine, that thoſe which ſound in your eares the Fathers and the Councels, do

it:

it not because the ancient Fathers are any thing fauourable vnto them, but because they know that the common people cannot tell how to disproue them, & that in those things you must of necessitie refer your selues vnto them. But touching the Scriptures, which you may and ought to know, & which rule all the Fathers, those your are forbidde to reade. Yeeres are not rules, and lying was from the beginning of the world. And if custome may serue for a law, tell me how many yeeres at the least are required to authorise a doctrine? The Church is not in a country gouernd by custome, but in a countrey gouerned by a written law. There is no prescription against the diuine truth. In the time of the Apostles this mysterie of iniquity began to bee hatched. How much then, thinke you, is it now increased? And in truth both the people and the pastors of the Church of Rome cry out since certaine yeeres past, that the Church hath need to be reformed. At the Councell of Pisa, *an.* 1411. Pope *Alexander* the 5. in the 20. Session, solemnly promised to spend some time to take order for the reformation of the Church, and to that end to assemble the wisest men of all nations. Not long after that, there was a Councell holden at Senes, *anno* 1423. where the proposition of the reformation of the Church was laid vpon the table, and after referred to another time: for they saw that they could not stirre that stone without shaking the Papall dignitie.

But that which great personages would not do, God hath doue it by meaner men, vsing vnexpected and vnhoped for meanes, to set the doctrine of saluation before the people eyes, in despite of all the forces that Satan could vse against it.

You are bound and beholding vnto those that haue taken

taken paines and trauelled in this worke, for this, that the holy Scripture (which the people saw not) is now translated into our mother tongue, and that the Spirit of God speaketh French, in such manner, that no man can be ignorant of the Word of God, but he that wilfully shuts his own eyes for feare to see the light. You are bound vnto them also for this, that the Pope doth now tyrannize lesse ouer you, then he did foure or fiue hundred yeeres past, and that your bondage is eased a fourth part: for then the Pope gaue those French men that at his commandement armed themselues (besides the remission of all their sinnes) a degree of honour in Paradise aboue other men. But if now at this day hee would by a Croysado send the French men into a farre countrey to fight against heretickes, or to conquer certaine townes (vpon his enemies) for him, as he did not long since, you would mocke and iest at his commandement. Then his manner was, when a king had offended him, to interdict his kingdome, & by that meanes (as much as in him lay) to excommunicate diuers millions of people, to command an intermission of diuine Seruice to be made throughout a great countrey, to forbid the bels to be rung, to hinder burials, and to expose the country for a prey to him that first could conquer it. England was sixe yeeres & a halfe in that state in the time of King *Iohn*; but at this day he pulls his sword no more out of the sheath, fearing, that taking so much vpon him, he should be the meanes to ouerthrow his owne dignity, which the doctrine of the Gospell hath already much shaken.

Such buls are found in Mathew Paris, and in the third Tome of the Counceils, at the end of the Counceil of Latran vnder Innocent the third.

You are also beholding vnto vs, that sellers of pardons run not throughout France from house to house, as they did in the time of *Boniface* the 9. and *Leo* the 10.

who

who for halfe a crowne sold to euery man that would haue them, a remission of all his sinnes, and the deliuerance of a soule out of Purgatory.

The time hath been, that in Fraunce men commonly spake of miracles of S. *Anthonies* fire, and of the apparition of damned soules, or such as were come out of Purgatory, which illusions are for the most part vanished away at the rising of the Sun of the holy Scripture, which the night of ignorance had hidden. And if at this day there are any small miracles spoken of, it is secretely, and neuer before vs: for before a man that feareth God, and knoweth him, Satan is as it were chained, and loseth all his force, and the magistrates themselues of your religion haue oftentimes punished such impostures corporally.

There are not many persons among you that wholly beleeue in their religion, & that find not fault with the Church of Rome. For it is hard for a man to support the Decrees and the Glosses, which say, [a] *that the Pope is Aboue the lawe, and that he hath power to dispence against the Apostles and the Gospell:* and [b] call the Pope God and Diuine maiestie: Or the lying Legēds, which in many things compare and equalize S. *Dominicke* and S. *Francis* to Iesus Christ: Or the opinion of those that cause S. *Francis* Cowle to be put vpon them when they are dying, because (as their Doctors say) that Cowle is as good as a second baptisme. Nor the runnings of poore people for pardons two hundred miles off, when remission of all our sins is offered at home vnto vs by the doctrine of the Gospell: Nor the pardons of seuen or eight hūdred thousand yeares: Nor the priuiledged altars, whereon a Masse being said, a soule is deliuered out of Purgatory: Nor the opinio of those that teach,

[a] *Tit. 8. de Praebend. cap. Prouisuit. Secundum plenitudinem potestatis de iure possumus supra ius dispensare. Ibidem Glossa: Papa contra Apostolum dispensat. Item contra vetus testamentum. Item iniuramento. Glossa Dist. 34. Can. Lector. Papa potest contra Apostolum dispensare. Et Causa 23. quest. 1. Can. Sunt quidam. Glossa habet, Dispensat in Euangelio interpretando ipsum.*

[b] *Glossa extrau. Cum inter Dominum Deum nostrum Papam. c. Concil. Later. vltimum Sess. 9 Diuinae maiestatis tuae consortium.*

teach, * that the Pope can make that which is sin, to be no sinne, and that which is no sinne, to be sinne. And it is certaine, that although we should say nothing, yet the truth speaketh in the consciences of many persons that are holde vnder this captiuity by the feare of men & their domesticall affaires; for the diuel tickleth men by the belly, and rocketh them in a cradle of pleasures and honours to bring them asleepe: whereby it happeneth, that the sparks of the truth known, are quenched in them, or if they be not quenched, they burne, and torment their consciences, & serue for nothing else but to make them more culpable, for hauing not onely buried their talet of the knowledge of God in the earth, but also for mis-spending the same; for hauing bin ashamed to confesse the Sonne of God before men, and not defending his cause when time required, and for fearing to offend men more then God, whose promises are certaine, his threatnings horrible, and his iudgements eternall and ineuitable: who hauing in our dayes shewed & done so many miracles to repaire the ruines of his Church in this Realme, will not leaue those vnpunished that seeke to trouble his worke, and that expresly wander out of the way at high noone-day.

* Bellarm. in Barkl. cap. 31. In bono sensu dedit Christus Petro potestatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum, & de non peccato peccatum.

All this which hath been spoken, proceeds from an ardent desire that we haue that you should be saued, and that God might be serued; for herein we haue no other interest then your saluation, seeing that for the defence of this cause, we receiue nothing but trouble, hatred and discōmodities. We rather much more desire to liue in peace and amitie with our fellow citizēs vnder one selfesame religion, if we could or might do it, without offence vnto God; and cease not to pray & beseech the Father of mercie (whose compassion surmounts

mounts our iniquities) that he will pardon those that hate vs, that he will touch their hearts with repentāce, and illuminate their vnderstanding with his light, to know the day of their visitation, and the way of eternall saluation, for feare that in the end he should turne his fauour from a people that turne their backs vnto him, and send greater darkenesse then the first, vpon a nation that striueth against the light of the Gospell.

If these considerations moue any man, it will be no small ioy vnto me, and an ample reward of my labour: If it happeneth otherwise, we shall at the least haue deliuered our soules, & discharged our consciences, and serued for a witnesse in so hard and stiffnecked an age, attending till the Sonne of God come from heauen, to heare our griefes, to deliuer his children, and to reward euery one according to his workes: to whom be glory eternally. Amen.

THE BVCKLER OF THE FAITH:

OR,

THE DEFENCE OF THE CONFESSION of the Reformed Churches of France, against the Obiections of M. Arnoux a Iesuite.

THE FIRST ARTICLE.

The Confession.

E beleeue and confesse, that there is one onely God, of one onely & simple essence, spirituall, inuisible, vnchangeable, infinite, incomprehensible, vnspeakeable; that can do all things, that is altogether wise, altogether good, altogether iust, and altogether mercifull.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

This God manifesteth himselfe to be so vnto men, first, by his works, as well in the creation, as in the cõseruation & gouernment thereof. Secondly, and more clearly, by his word, which in the beginning being reuealed

uealed by oracle, hath since by writing bene reduced into the bookes which we call the holy Scripture.

M. *Arnoux* dealeth not at all with these two articles, and consequently by his silence approueth them.

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

Wherein the Canonicall Scriptures are spoken of.

All this holy Scripture is contained and comprehended in the canonicall bookes of the old and new Testament, videlicet, The fiue bookes of *Moses*, which are, Genesis, Exodus, Leuiticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomie: *Iosua*, Iudges, *Ruth*, the first and second bookes of *Samuel*, the first and second bookes of Kings, the first and second bookes of Chronicles, (otherwise called Paralipomenon) the first book of *Esdras*, *Nehemia*, the booke of *Hester*, *Iob*, the Psalmes of *Dauid*, the Prouerbes or Sentences of *Salomon*, the booke of Ecclesiastes, called the Preacher, the Canticles of *Salomon*, the bookes of *Esay*, *Ieremie*, the Lamentations of *Ieremie*, *Ezechiel*, *Daniel*, *Osea*, *Ioel*, *Amos*, *Abdias*, *Ionas*, *Michea*, *Nahum*, *Abacuc*, *Sophonia*, *Aggee*, *Zacharias*, *Malachie*; the holy Gospels of Saint *Mathew*, Saint *Marke*, Saint *Luke*, and Saint *Iohn*, the second booke of Saint *Luke*, otherwise called the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of S. *Paul*, one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to *Timothie*, one to *Titus*, one to *Philemon*, one to the Hebrewes, the Epistle of Saint *Iames*, the first and second Epistle of Saint *Peter*, the first, second,

ſecond and third Epiſtles of Saint *Iohn*, the Epiſtle of Saint *Iude*, and the Apocalyps or the Reuelation of Saint *Iohn*.

OF THE BOOKES CALLED APOCRYPHA.

ARNOVX.

Out of this Canon they cut off the bookes of Tobie, Iudith, Baruch, Eccleſiaſticus, the Wiſedome of Salomon, and the Machabees, and all whatſoeuer diſpleaſeth them, out of the Scriptures.

MOVLIN.

He that can reade the Hebrew tongue, knowes well that this accuſation is falſe and vntrue. The Hebrew Bible is the originall of the old Teſtament; for it was neceſſary and conuenient, that thoſe bookes which containe in them the doctrine of the people of God, ſhould be written in the naturall language of the people of God. Now the bookes of *Tobias*, and of *Iudith*, &c. are not found in the Hebrew Bible, how then can we cut thoſe bookes out of the Bible, which were neuer therein? The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* in his third Chapter to the Romans, verſe 2. ſaith, that *The diuine Oracles of God were committed vnto the Iewes.* Now the Iewes neuer acknowledged theſe bookes: they were not read in their Synagogues, neither did the Prieſts nor the Scribes euer expound them to the people.

The teſtimony of the Church of the old Teſtament is of more credit touching the bookes of the old Teſtament, then the Romane Church that now is. For here I ſpeake of the Iewes; not ſuch as they are at this day, but then when they onely were the Church and people of God. Reade *Ioſephus* againſt *Appian*, alledged by *Euſebius*, lib. 3. cap. 10. There you ſhall ſee, that the Iewiſh Church did not receiue theſe bookes of *Iudith*, *Tobias*, &c. And Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe and

his Apoſtles, who often and many times alledge the bookes of the old Teſtament, neuer alledge thoſe bookes: (M. *Arnoux* that ſaith, that Ieſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles alledged them in the new Teſtament, ſhould produce examples for the ſame.) But thoſe that ſpeake but by heare-ſay, commonly are moſt bold in their aſſertions. Ieſus Chriſt in the laſt of Saint *Luke*, verſe 44. comprehendeth all the Scriptures vnder the Law of *Moſes*, the Prophets, and the Pſalmes. Vnder any of theſe parts, neither the bookes of *Tobias*, *Iudith*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Suſanna*, nor the *Machabees* are contained. Hereunto let vs adde the falſe fables which in theſe bookes are ſet downe vnto vs for truth.

Pag. 41. of his anſwer.

In the fifth Chapter of *Tobias*, the Angell *Raphael* is falſely ſaid to be one of the Tribe of *Nephtaly*, captiues in Nineue.

The Author of the booke of *Iudith*, in the fourth Chapter thereof, verſe 2. and Chapter 5. 16. ſpeaketh as if this hiſtorie happened after the deſtruction of the Temple, and after the returne from captiuitie: and yet in the firſt and ſecond Chapters, this hiſtorie is recited as hauing hapned vnder the reigne of *Nabuchodonoſor* reigning in Nineue, dead aboue ſixtie yeeres before; King *Arphaxad* reigning in Media: but then there was no King *Arphaxad*, for one King then reigned both in Aſſyria and Media: and likewiſe Nineue at that time was deſtroyed, witneſſe the laſt verſe of the booke of *Tobias*, conformable to the propheſie of *Nahum*: and not long before, it had bene taken and deſtroyed by *Cyaxares* King of Media, as *Herodotus* writeth in his firſt booke.

In the 49. of Geneſis, *Iacob* lying vpon his death-bed, condemneth the ſpoyling and murther of the Sichemites, done by *Simeon* and *Leui*, as an impudent and cruell action. Neuertheleſſe, *Iudith* in the ninth Chapter praiſeth and exalteth that action. There alſo ſhe deſireth grace of God to deceiue with her lips: and purpoſely, being curiouſly and brauely attired, to moue the Pagan Prince to be in loue with her, ſhe commendeth his valour and braue ſpirit, ſaith that ſhe cannot refuſe to do any thing that he requeſteth, Chap. 11. 13. She pro-

promiseth to conduct and guide him throughout all Iudea, and to place his throne in Ierusalem, chap. 11. 16. so farre as falsely to interpose the Name of God for a couerture of her lies, verse 13. 14. and 15.

Saint *Augustine* in his second booke of Retractations, saith, that the booke of Wisedome was not made by *Salomon*. Saint *Hierome* attributeth it vnto *Philo* the Iew, in his Preface vpon the bookes of *Salomon*: neuertheless the Author of the booke affirmeth himselfe to be a King; and speaketh as if he were *Salomon*.

Saint *Hierome* in his Preface vpon the Commentaries of *Daniel* saith, that the booke of *Susanna*, and of Bel and the Dragon, are fables. And what apparence or likelihood is there, that a handfull of Iewes, captiues in Babylon, should haue Israelites for Iudges in Babylon, that should command one absolutely to be executed to death without appeale, and that a child should make himselfe a Iudge of Iudges, who without other forme of proceeding were condemned to die? Who knowes not, that in Babylon, the vulgar language was Chaldean, and not Greeke? and yet the Historie of *Susanna* with her Greek allusions vpon the etimologies of the Holme and the Masticke trees, presupposed that the ordinary language which they vsed in iudgements and publike actions was Greeke.

Susanna Veliss que ac Draconis fabulas non contineri in Hebraico.

ὑπὸ σχίνον, σχίσει σε μέσον ὁ Θεὸς· ὑπὸ πρῖνον πρίσαι σε μέσον.

In the bookes of *Machabees*, *Antiochus* the famous died three times in seuerall manner: in the first booke chap. 6. he died at Babylon in his bed. But in the first Chapter of the second booke, he died in the Temple of *Nannee* ouerwhelmed with stones: and in the ninth Chapter of the same booke hee died in the mountaines, falling out of his chariot as he returned out of Persia; and all that is said to happen in the time of *Iudas Machabeus*, in whose time there was but one onely King *Antiochus*.

In the eighth Chapter of the first booke of *Machabees*, it is said, that the Romans had taken King *Antiochus* the Great prisoner, and that they had giuen the Indies to *Eumenes*. All that is false. The Romans ouerthrew *Antiochus* in three bat-

tels, but neuer tooke him prisoner. They neuer had any part of the Indies: their greatest Empire neuer extended it selfe much beyond the riuer Euphrates. See Saint *Ierome* vpon *Daniel*, *Appian Alexandrine*, *Zozimus* and *Iustin*.

Little children know, that then the Romans euery yeere made two Consuls that had soueraigne power: but in the sixteenth verse of the eight Chapter of the first booke of *Machabees* it is said, that the Romans euery yeere committed the gouernement of their Seigniorie to one man alone.

In the twelfth Chapter of the first of *Machabees*, there is an excellent thing to be noted, which is, a letter written by *Arius* King of Sparta, to *Onias* the high Priest of the Iewes, wherein it is said, that they of Sparta, (which are the Lacedæmonians,) are of *Abrahams* race. Can there be a foolisher thing alledged? And it is to be found, that in the time of *Onias*, there was no such King *Arius* in Sparta. For *Arius* (as *Pausanias* in his Laconiques, and *Plutarch* in the life of *Pyrrhus* say) liued aboue eight hundred yeeres before that.

In the first Chapter of the second booke, and nineteenth verse, it is said, that the Iewes were led captiues into Persia, in stead of saying into Babylon.

In the second Chapter it is said, that *Ieremie* hid the Arke of the Lord in a ditch, that it might be found againe when God should reassemble the people, when they returned out of captiuitie: which is contradicted by *Ieremie* himselfe in the third Chapter and sixteenth verse, where it is said, *In those dayes, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The Arke of the couenant of God.* And in the Temple built againe by *Zorobabel* the Arke was no more there.

Rabbi Shelomo Iarki initio prophetiæ Aggai, v. 8.

And at the end thereof, the Author acknowledging his weakenesse, doubteth whether he had said well or no. *If* (saith he) *I haue done well, and as it is fitting the Historie:* and a little after, *If I haue spoken slenderly and meanely, it is that which I could attaine vnto.* The Spirit of God doubteth not whether he hath said well, excuseth not his style, nor confesseth his imbecillitie. In the vulgar translation the Author asketh pardon, saying, *If I haue not spoken as I should do, you must pardon me.*

me. Is it a conuenient thing for the Spirit of God to aske pardon of men? And which is more, in the ſecond Chapter, verſe 19. he aduertiſeth vs what account we ſhould make of his booke, ſaying, *We will aſſay to abridge the fiue bookes of Iaſon the Cyrenian into one volume.* What? ſhall the abridgement of a prophane booke be a Canonicall booke? To follow the inſpirations of the Spirit of God, muſt we follow the ſteps of a prophane booke? He alſo ſaith that he hath made that abridgement with great labour and much watching, as if he had taken extreme paines to make a ſmall book full of fables.

The booke of the reſt of the Hiſtorie of *Heſter*, in many things contrarieth the booke of *Heſter* which is in the Hebrew Bible. In the firſt Chapter it is ſhewed, that it happened in the ſecond yeere of King *Artaxerxes*, which in the true Hiſtorie, chap. 2. verſe 16. is placed in the ſeuenth yeere of *Aſſuerus*. *Haman* is called a Macedonian, chap. 6. verſe 10. who in the true Hiſtorie is ſaid to be an Agagien, that is, an Amalekite. And this lying booke in the fourteenth verſe ſaith, that *Haman* ſought to tranſport the Empire of the Perſians to the Macedonians. As if one ſhould ſay, that ſome French man ſhould haue enterpriſed to tranſport the Empire of the Turkes to the King of *Iuetot*: for then the Kings of Macedonia were little Kings, vnknowne to the Perſians, and of no power.

ARNOVX.

They quote no text in the margent. This Canon of the Scriptures made according to their pleaſures, and without authoritie, hath no proofe in the Scripture, by the which they can iuſtifie this enormous abridgement of the number of the bookes in times paſt receiued in the ancient Church. Therefore I challenge this fundamentall article to be falſe, and nought worth. 2. Sect.

MOVLIN.

This diſcourſe is as much as nothing, for it hath no ground. This Doctor requireth of vs a paſſage in the holy Scriptures, which containeth the catalogue and number of the canonicall

bookes. I answer, that as to proue there is but foure Euangelists in the new Testament, it is not necessary to produce a passage which saith, that there is but foure bookes of the Gospell, that is, Saint *Mathew*, Saint *Marke*, Saint *Luke*, and Saint *Iohn*, but it is sufficient to reade the titles, and to looke ouer the inscriptions of the bookes: so to proue by the Scripture, the number of the Canoniall books, it sufficeth to take the Bible in the originall tongue, and looke ouer the titles of the bookes. By this meanes you shall there finde all the bookes contained in the article of our Confession: and there you shall not find *Tobias*, *Iudith*, the *Machabees*, &c. So the Apostles Creed is found by pieces in the Scripture, although it be not found whole in any one passage alone. The holy Scripture saith, that God is Truth, *Rom.* 3. The it followeth, that the bookes full of lies, as *Iudith*, and the *Machabees*, are not the Word of God. Then touching this Discourse made by M. *Arnoux*, we will, as he doth, say nothing.

ARNOVX.

3. *Sect.* *Contrary places of Scripture, Apocalyps* 22. *verse* 19. If any man shall diminish of the words of the booke of this prophesie, God shall take away his part out of the booke of life, and out of the holy Citie, and from those things which are written in this booke, *Deuter.* 12. 32. What thing soeuer I command you, obserue to do it, thou shalt not adde thereto nor diminish from it. *And more plainely, Chap.* 4. 2. You shall not adde vnto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish ought from it. *These passages according to the sence which they giue vnto them, and according to the vse wherevnto they employ them, without reply ouerthrow the third article quoted before: albeit they haue no force against our traditions, which is an argument against him that so hardly presseth vpon them. For if by these passages they ordinarily dispute against our traditions, as pieces that are out of the formall passage of the holy Scriptures, by the same passages I reuerse their Canon, whereof I finde no formall passage: which to haue, it is necessary that the excluding*

cluding of the passages which they reiect, must be formally marked in some place of the Scripture; with the numbring of all those bookes which they receiue.

MOVLIN.

I haue already answered to that, and shewed that the numbring of the canonicall bookes is expressly proued by the Scriptures: whereby the passages which condemne those that adde or diminish, to or from the Word of God, touch not vs at all; but are so many thunder-bolts against the Church of Rome, which establisheth traditions, and an vnwritten word, to be of like authority with the holy Scriptures: but that shall be made more euident in the Section following.

ARNOVX.

Then I say, That the Canon of the Scriptures is an article of the faith. 4. Sect.

MOVLIN.

To speake properly; The articles of the faith, are the doctrines of Christian religion. In this sence, the numbring of the canonicall bookes is no article of the faith, but a declaration and numbring of the bookes, from whence the articles of the faith and the instructions of Christian religion are drawne. In the same maner, as the numbring of the books of *Hippocrates* and *Galen* is not a precept of Physicke, but a designement to the places and the bookes wherein the precepts of Physicke are to be found; and that is the meaning of our Confession. For seeking by order to set downe the articles and doctrines of Christian faith, at the beginning it declareth from whence these doctrines are drawne. Which declaration is no addition to the Scripture: first, because that this numbring of the catalogue is proued by the Scripture, as we haue shewed. Secondly, forasmuch as to declare that such bookes are Canonicall, (that is, rules of our faith,) is not to adde any thing to those sacred bookes, but rather to declare that we must not adde any thing vnto them. It is an acknowledgement that we make of their perfection, and of

our

our obedience. When we say that the Scripture is sufficient to salvation, thereby we vnderstand, that we must reiect all those doctrines which adde any thing to the Scriptures. Now to say that these bookes are Canonicall, is not to adde any thing to the Scripture, but to declare that we must not adde any thing thereunto. Then it is false that master *Arnoux* saith, that setting down this number of the canonicall books, we adde something to the Scripture, seeing that on the contrary we thereby declare, that we must adde nothing thereunto, for that those bookes are the Canon and rule of our faith.

Of the testimony which the Church giueth of the Canonicall bookes.

ARNOVX.

5. Sect. *Then I say: The Canon of the Scripture is an article of the faith, and being an article of the faith, either they receiue it immediatly from the Church of God, (whether it be Iudaicall or Christian,) or from the holy Scripture. If from the Church, they do vainly attribute the discretion and knowledge of this Canon to the interior perswasion of the Spirit, and falsely teach in their fift article, that the Scripture is the rule of all that which we ought to beleeue. If from the Scripture, let them quote some formall passage, together with the booke and the chapter, where this Canon is set downe, and the excluding of the rest of the bookes which the Church receiueth: which because they neither do nor can, let them confesse, that this Canon which is the foundation of all their Beliefe, is grounded vpon nothing, and not vpon the Word of God, and by them added to the Scripture.*

MOVLIN.

Before, 4. Section. We haue already confuted that, and proued that the numbring of the Canonicall bookes, contained in the article of our Confession, and the excluding of the rest that are apocry-

pha,

pha, is clearely proued by the Scripture; and that, if it could not be proued by the Scripture, yet this numbring doth not adde any thing to the Scripture. Touching that which he demandeth, whether we receiue the Canon of the Scripture immediatly from the Church of God: I acknowledge, that euery one receiueth the holy Scripture immediatly from the Church in his countrey where he dwelleth, whether it be a pure, or an impure and hereticall church. So the Apoſtles receiued the bookes of the old Teſtament from the High prieſts and the Scribes, enemies to Ieſus Chriſt. So the Neſtorians and the Eutychians gaue the Scriptures to thoſe whom they taught. But therein the Church (be it pure or impure) onely doth the office of a witneſſe, and not of a Iudge. She atteſteth onely that thoſe bookes are ſacred and Canonicall, but ſhe maketh them not ſacred, nor yet giueth them any authority. The tradition of the Church teſtifying that thoſe bookes are diuine and Canonicall, is but a proteſtation of her ſubiection to the Scriptures, and not an addition to their imperfection, nor an vſurpation of authority ouer the written Word of God. The Booke-ſeller that ſheweth a chapman a booke of the ordinances and laws of this Realme, doth not thereby authoriſe thoſe ordinances. He that ſheweth the King to a ſtranger, is not therefore aboue the King, neither giueth authority to the King. An inferior may teſtifie before a greater perſon then himſelfe. And it hath oftentimes fallen out, that a man hauing receiued the Scriptures by the hands of the Church in his country, by the ſame Scripture hath corrected and iuſtly condemned the ſame Church of hereſie from the which he receiued the Scripture.

That which is moſt conſiderable in this place, is, that as the Church atteſteth that theſe bookes are the holy Scriptures, ſo the holy Scripture atteſteth, that there muſt be a Church in the world; and that the Scripture abundantly teacheth what Church it ought to be, and preſcribeth lawes vnto it. So it appeareth, that the teſtimony which the Scripture giueth of the Church, is much ſtronger then that which the Church giueth of the Scripture. For the witneſſe which the

Church

Church giueth of the Scripture, is a ſimple declaration to acknowledge thoſe bookes to be the Word of God, and a proteſtation to obey them. But the witneſſe which the Scripture giueth to the Church, is a rule, and a law, making the Church ſubiect thereunto: for by the Scripture we vnderſtand not the paper and the letters printed thereon, but the diuine inſtructions contained therein. The Church is compounded of men, who both in groſſe and retaile, are ſubiects to this Word, and ſhall one day be iudged by the ſame, howſoeuer they (with abominable pride) brag and boaſt themſelues to be Iudges of the holy Scripture, and giue authority thereunto. Touching particular inſpiration, and the perfection of the holy Scriptures, it ſhall be ſpoken of hereafter.

What the beliefe of the ancient Church was touching theſe Canonicall books. And whether the Church is the infallible Iudge of the ſence of the Scriptures.

ARNOVX.

6. Sect. *As for vs, in this reſpect we are out of danger, becauſe we receiue the Scriptures and the interpretations, Canon, and true ſence of the ſame from the hand of Gods Spouſe, and freely confeſſe that this Canon is a tradition, whereby we haue the truth, and the puritie of the holy Scriptures.*

MOVLIN.

Our aduerſaries to couer themſelues againſt the Scripture, haue recourſe to the Church, which Church neuertheleſſe they belie, and openly contraty it. Maſter *Arnoux* ſaith, that he hath receiued the Canonicall books from the Church, and in the meane time he oppoſeth himſelfe againſt the number of the Canonicall bookes, and openly contradicteth the conſent of all the ancient Church, as well of the old as the new Teſtament.

Touching

Touching the Church of the old Teſtament, we haue ſhewed, that by it the bookes of *Tobias*, *Iudith*, *Wiſdome*, *Machabees*, &c. were neuer receiued, nor holden to be canonicall.

Touching the Church of the new Teſtament, Ieſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles neuer vſed nor alledged them. The Councell of Laodicea holden about the ſame time that the firſt Councell of Nice was holden, maketh a catalogue of the bookes of the old Teſtament, wherein the bookes of *Tobias*, *Iudith*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Wiſedome*, *Suſanna*, and the bookes of the *Machabees* are not numbred.

S. *Ieroms* in his Preface vpon the bookes of *Salomon*, ſpeaking of *Eccleſiaſticus* and the *Wiſedome* of *Salomon*, ſaith; *As the Church readeth the bookes of Iudith, Tobias, and the Machabees, but receiueth them not among the canonicall Scriptures; ſo alſo let her reade theſe two volumes, but not to confirme the faith of the Church.* Note here that he ſaith, that it is the beliefe of the Church. He ſaith the ſame in his Prologue.

Saint *Cyprian*, or rather *Ruffin*, in the booke of the Expoſition of the Creed, after he had made a catalogue of the canonicall bookes, ſaith: *You muſt vnderſtand that there are other bookes which the ancient Church did not call canonicall, but Eccleſiaſticall; as the Wiſedome of Salomon, Eccleſiaſticus, Tobias, Iudith, and the bookes of Machabees. All which they would haue to be read in the Church, but not to be vſed for the confirmation of the authoritie of the faith.*

Saint *Athanaſius* in his booke entitled Synopſis, names all the bookes of the old Teſtament, conformable to the Hebrew Bible, and then addeth, and ſaith: *Beſides theſe there are other bookes of the old Teſtament, which are not canonicall, which are read only vnto Catechumenians, as the Wiſedome of Salomon, the Wiſedome of Ieſus the ſonne of Sirach, Iudith, Tobias, &c.*

Euſebius in his Chronicle vpon the 117. Olympiade, ſaith, *The Hebrew hiſtory of the Machabees reckons from hence the reigne of the Grecians, but theſe bookes are not receiued among the diuine Scriptures.*

Pope

Pope *Grégorie* the firſt, in the 19. of his Morals vpon *Iob*, cap. 19. ſeeking to alledge a paſſage out of the *Machabees*, excuſeth himſelfe in theſe words: *Of which thing we ſpeake not without reaſon, if we produce the teſtimonies of the bookes that are not canonicall, but written for the edification of the Church.*

Meliton Biſhop of Sardis, in an Epiſtle to *Oneſimus*, recited by *Euſebius* in the fourth booke of his hiſtorie, cap. 15. numbreth the bookes of the old Teſtament, wherein he placeth not *Iudith*, *Tobias*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, nor the *Machabees*.

Origen, in *Euſebius*, lib. 6. cap. 24. Saint *Hilarie* in his Preface vpon the Pſalmes, *Gregorie Nazianzen* in his verſes of the holy Scripture, *Euzebius* lib. 3. of his hiſtorie, cap. 10. *Epiphanius* in his booke of Meaſures, and diuers others, make catalogues of the bookes of the old Teſtament, and put not *Iudith*, *Tobias*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Wiſedome* nor *Machabees* into them, but all with one accord ſay, that there are but twentie two bookes in the old Teſtament, agreeable to the letters in the Hebrew Alphabet.

The fourth Councell of Carthage, in their Latine copies put the bookes of *Machabees* among the Canonicall bookes; but in their Greeke copies they are not found to be there. It is moſt certaine, that there is no book more falſified nor corrupted then the Latine tomes of the Councels.

Againſt this ſo vniuerſall a conſent of the ancient Church, they oppoſe the onely teſtimonie of Saint *Auguſtine*, who lib. 2 of Chriſtian doctrine, cap. 8. putteth *Tobias*, *Iudith* and the *Machabees* among the Canonicall books. But ye muſt vnderſtand, that in the ſame place he maketh two ſorts of canonicall bookes, the one of greater, the other of leſſe authoritie; the one really receiued, the other receiued by ſome Churches of leſſe authoritie. *In matter* (ſaith he) *of the canonicall Scriptures, we muſt follow the greater number of Catholicke Churches.* And a little after, *Among thoſe which are not receiued of all, we muſt make moſt account of thoſe, which more Churches, and of more authoritie do receiue.* And he himſelfe in the 23. chap. of his ſecond booke againſt *Gaudentius*, ſaith, that

In Canonicis Scripturis Eccleſiarum catholicarum quamplurium authoritatem ſequatur.

In eis quæ non accipiuntur ab

that the booke of *Machabees is not vnprofitably read; if it be read discreetly: and that the same booke is none of those whereof Iesus Christ witnesseth.* Also in the same place of the 2. book of Christian doctrine, he acknowledgeth that the booke of Wisdome was not made by *Salomon*: which is a proofe that the Author thereof lyeth, which affirmeth himselfe to be *Salomon.* And in the same place he omitteth the booke of *Susanna*, and the historie of Bel and the Dragon, as not being canonicall. And in the three and twentieth Chapter of the same booke, as also in diuers other places, he beleeued not that *Samuel* appeared to * *Saul*, but is of opinion that it was his image and a diuelliſh illuſion, therein contrarying the booke of *Ecclesiasticus.* In the seuenth tome *Hilarie* Bishop of Arles writeth to Saint *Augustine*, & telleth him, that diuers seruants of Christ in France did not thinke well of him, that he had alledged a passage of *Ecclesiasticus* in his booke: * *They define* (saith he) *that the same passage ought to be omitted, as not being canonicall.* It is to no purpose to say, that diuers Fathers alledge these bookes, for they also alledge the third and fourth bookes of *Esdras*, which the Councell of Trent receiueth not for canonicall. *Ambrose* alledgeth them in the tenth Chapter of his booke of the benefit of death, cap. 10. and *Augustine* in the sixth Chapter of the fourth booke to *Boniface.* The allegations of particular persons are no publicke rules, nor the opinion of the vniuersall Church. A man may alledge a booke which is not holden to be canonicall. S. *Paul* alledged *Aratus* and *Epimenides* Pagan Authors.

omnibus, praponat eas quas plures grauioresque accipiunt, eis quas pauciores minoriſque authoritatis Ecclesiæ tenent.

* *Imago Samuelis mortui Saul regi venturam prænunciauit.*

See the 15. Chapter of the booke, *de cura pro mortuis.*

* *Hoc tanquam non Canonicum definiunt oportere mittendum.*

Now it appeareth whether M. *Arnoux* hath any knowledge of Antiquity, and whether he hath reason to say, that he hath receiued the Canon of the Scriptures from the Church; seeing that all the ancient Church reiected those bookes which the Church of Rome receiues for canonicall. But now at this day, when we speake of the Church, we must by the Church vnderstand the Pope. For the Councell of Rome, holden in the yeere 1076. vnder *Gregorie* the seuenth, ordained, *that no chapter nor booke should be held to be canonicall, without the Popes authority.* Must we haue an approbation from

Acts 17. 28. Tit. 1. 12.

Baron. Annal. anno 1076. sect. 33. Quod nullum caput, nullus quo liber Canonicus habeatur absque illius authoritate.

from the Pope to receiue the fiue bookes of *Moſes*, and the foure Euangeliſts for canonicall? What is he that doth not abhorre the impious words of the Romiſh decree, in the 19. diſtinction of the Canon *In Canonicis*: whereof the ſuperſcription is, That *the decrees of Popes are reckoned among the canonicall bookes*? which they proue by a paſſage out of Saint *Auguſtine* wickedly falſified.

Inter canonicas Scripturas Decretales Epiſtolæ connumerantur.

With the like impietie, at this day, they will haue the Church to be Iudge of the ſence of the Scriptures. There are two kindes or ſorts of iudgements, the one, a iudgement of diſcretion, the other a iudgement of authority. By the iudgement of diſcretion we iudge of meats, not to preſcribe lawes, but to diſcerne what is good for vs. Of this iudgement the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the firſt of the Corinthians, chap. 10. verſe 15. *I ſpeake as vnto them which haue vnderſtanding, iudge ye what I ſay.* By this iudgement, Saint *Iohn* in his firſt Epiſtle chap. 4. will haue vs not to beleeue euery ſpirit, but that we ſhould trie the ſpirits. But there is another kinde of iudgement, which is a iudgement of authority; which ſerueth for a law, and which maketh decrees, againſt the which it is not lawfull to reſiſt. In that maner the court of Parliamẽt iudgeth capitall crimes. Between theſe two kinds of iudgement, there is a third kind, which participateth with the other two, wch being a iudgement of diſcretion, in the meane time hath a kinde of authority: As when diuers learned and wiſe men giue their aduice vpon any difficult matter, ſpecially if they be men to whom, by the commandement of God, we owe reſpect and reuerence. Whom, although ſubiect to erre, and though they pronounce not iudgement with ſoueraigne authority and infaillible certainty, we are neuertheleſſe aſhamed to contradict; and we are bound to be content with their iudgement, vntill the thing be better knowne and examined. Such is the iudgement of diuers Paſtors aſſembled in a nationall or a prouincall Synode: whoſe iudgement neuertheleſſe is not ſoueraigne, but ſubiect to be examined by the Word of God; as latter Councels oftentimes correct precedent Councels. But to eſteeme that the Church may iudge of matters

matters of faith, and of the sence of the Scriptures, with iudgement of soueraigne authoritie, and with infallible certainty; it is a thing not onely vniust and absurd, but also impossible. For, in the question whether the Church is Iudge, or not, is it possible that the Church should be soueraigne & infallible Iudge therein? And when question is made, to know what the duety of the Church is, is it reasonable that the Church should be Iudge, with full authority of deciding the same? for by this meanes, she shall be bound to do no more then she will her selfe, and to obey those lawes which she shall gine vnto her selfe. And when question is made of the infallibleneesse or authority of the Church, if the Church be Iudge therein, she shall be Iudge in her owne cause. Seeing therefore, that all the Prelates of the Church are sinners, and by consequence culpable, and punishable by the Law, what apparence is there, that criminals should be soueraigne and infallible Iudges of the sence of that Law which concerneth their crime? by this meanes they shall neuer be condemned. It is a ridiculous and prophane conceit, to imagine that transgressors of the Law should be infallible Iudges of the same Law whereby they ought to be iudged. If the Church were an infallible Iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, her authority should be much greater then that of God, for such an interpreter would be much more obeyed then the law-maker; for that the people should not be subiect to the words of the Law, but to the sence and the interpretation which that interpreter would giue thereupon; which is the meanes whereby the Pope hath made himselfe so great, and so rich; for still he interpreteth the word of God for his profit, and hath proceeded so farre, that in the Romish decrees, there are glosses that say, that the Pope *may dispence with the Scriptures, by interpreting the same.*

Causa 25. quæst. 1. Car. Sunt quidam. Dispensat in Euangelio interpretando ipsum.

Neuertheleſſe, let vs say that so absurd and impossible a thing is iust and receiuable; yet, before the authority of a Iudge and an infallible interpreter of the Scripture be referred to a Church, we ought to be well assured, that the same Church is of sound iudgement, and pure in the faith. Into the

which examination if we enter by the Scriptures, then such a Church is subiect to be iudged by the Scripture. Or if to know whether such a Church is pure in faith, mé refer themselues to the iudgement of the same Church, she will be sure not to condemne her selfe. And there is no Church, how corrupt soeuer it be, which vaunteth not of her selfe to be pure. And among diuers Churches, as the Syrian, the Greeke, the Romane, and the Affricane, who all draw their successions from the Apostles, and boast that they haue Saint *Peters* chaire; why should one be iudge rather then the other? Then we must necessarily haue recourse to the Scripture, which is one, and receiued by all, and an vncorrupted Iudge, and where in that which is cleare and euident, hauing no need of an interpretation, is sufficient to saluation. Where, if in things necessary to saluation, there are any obscure passages, they are found to be interpreted and expounded in diuers other cleare passages. For no man but the Law-giuer, can giue interpretations to the Law, that are of equall authority with the Law. And if there be any obscure passages found in the Scriptures, which are not expounded elsewhere, it is better to be ignorant, then to presume to be infallible Iudges of the sence of the Word, by the which God shall iudge vs: for that which therein is cleare and manifest, is sufficient to saluation.

THE FOVRTH ARTICLE OF THE CONFESSION OF THE FAITH.

Wherein M. Arnoux handleth particular inspiration, and the interpretation of the Scriptures, and the witnesse which the Church giueth to the Scriptures.

We confesse these bookes to be Canonicall, and certaine rules of our faith, not so much by the com-

mo

mon conſent and agreement of the Church, as by the teſtimonie and interior perſwaſion of the holy Ghoſt, which makes vs to diſcerne them from the other Eccleſiaſticall bookes, vpon the which (although they be profitable) we cannot ground any article of faith.

ARNOVX.

This is to make euery faithfull perſon a Iudge eſtabliſhed by God, to approue and reproue the Scriptures by a more infallible ſpirit in euery one of them, then it is in the vniuerſall Church, ſeeing, that by their ſaying, it may erre, notwithſtanding the infallible aſſiſtance of the holy Ghoſt: and yet neuertheleſſe euery faithfull perſon in particular hath a ſure and a domeſtique ſpirit, which maketh him a certaine Iudge of the Scriptures, and of their ſence and tranſlation, without the which the ſence cannot be penetrated by them that know not the languages. 7. Section.

MOVLIN.

Here the aduerſarie doth as he vſeth to do in all other places, that is, he changeth the words of our Confeſſion, and maketh vs ſay things that we do not beleeue: which is a manifeſt & euident proofe that the truth of our religion is very ſtrong, ſeeing that they cannot diſpute againſt it, vntill they haue firſt changed it. By this meanes our aduerſaries ſtriue not againſt our Confeſſion, but againſt their own inuentions. M. *Arnoux* imputeth to our Confeſſion, that it maketh euery man a particular Iudge eſtabliſhed by God, to approue and reproue the Scriptures, and infallibly to Iudge of the ſence and tranſlations of them. But the article of our Confeſſion ſaith nothing ſo. Therein we ſpeak not of a Iudge eſtabliſhed by God, nor of iudging infallibly of the ſence and interpretation of the Scriptures: for none of vs attribute vnto our ſelues this qualitie of a Iudge iudging with authority and infallible certainty.

For, to diſcerne whether ſuch a booke be Canonicall, it is not neceſſary to haue a particular reuelation: onely we ſay

two things. The one, that the Spirit of God witneſſeth to all Chriſtians that God is no lier, and by conſequence he witneſſeth, that the bookes of *Iudith* and of the *Machabees* are not diuine books, becauſe therein vntruths are palpable. The other, that the word of God contained in the holy Scriptures is full of efficacie, and that the Spirit of God vſed the ſame to touch the hearts without any need of particular reuelation. For he that feareth God, feeleth by a ſinely motion, and taketh pleaſure in the language of the ſpirit of God, which of it ſelfe maketh a man ſufficiently to vnderſtand, hauing another manner of vertue then the language of men. Which vertue if our aduerſaries do not feele, they ought not to mocke at a thing which they know not: but rather therein acknowledge the iuſt iudgement of God, which doth iuſtly, to take away from his word the efficacie thereof in them, for a puniſhmẽt, becauſe they do it iniurie, accuſing it of obſcuritie, ambiguitie, and imperfection, adding thereunto an vnwritten word, bereauing it of the dignitie to be a perfect rule & ſoueraigne Iudge, to cloath & inueſt the Prelates of the Church, and mens traditions with that dignitie. Why ſhould ſhe make her ſpirituall motions to be felt by thoſe that charge her with iniurious words, and which forbid and prohibit the reading thereof? Saint *Auguſtine* in the third Chapter of the eleuenth book of his Confeſſions, acknowledgeth this interior efficacy of the Spirit of God, giuing teſtimony to our hearts, touching the truth of that which is contained in the Scriptures, and ſpeaketh by experience. Vpon which paſſage, *Bellarmine* in his Sermon *De lumine fidei*, ſaith, *This light of the faith, is a certaine teſtimony of God, by the which is is ſaid vnto the ſecret cogitations of our hearts, That is true, thou needeſt not to doubt thereof.* Euen as he that knoweth not that the Sunne is the Sunne, but onely becauſe his mother told him ſo, and pointed to it with her finger, ſhould ground vpon a proofe a thouſand times leſſe cleare then the Sunne: ſo he that knoweth not that the holy Scripture is the Scripture, but onely becauſe the Church wherein he liued told him ſo, without being touched in his heart with the efficacie thereof,

of, groundeth himselfe vpon a proofe a thousand times weaker then the holy Scriptures: which maketh it selfe to be sufficiently felt by those that do not contend and striue against the same, and without the which we should not know, that there must be a Church in the world.

It is true, that the Church putteth the Scripture into our hands: But after that by the same Scripture God hath touched our hearts, we do no more beleeue that it is the holy Scripture, because the Church told vs so, but because the Scripture it selfe hath caused vs to know it, and that God thereby hath touched our hearts: without the which vertue the testimony of the Church is but a probable aide, which giueth a confused beliefe and a light impression. For no man can know with a certaine knowledge, that the testimonie which his Church giueth to the Scripture is true, if before that he knoweth not that the same Church is orthodoxall, and of a true iudgement touching the faith. Which a man cannot assuredly know, vntill he hath first knowne the rule of the true faith, which is the word of God. To be short, when we are once drawne to the reading and meditation of the Scripture by the testimonie of the Church, and haue begun to taste the same, and to comprehend the doctrine thereof, we may say as the Samaritanes did to the woman whereof it is spoken in the fourth of Saint *Iohn*: *Now we beleeue, not because of thy saying, for we haue heard him our selues, and know that this is indeed that Christ the Sauiour of the world.*

Here I would gladly demand two things of our aduersaries: one, whether they will haue euery faithfull Christian to receiue and approue the holy Scriptures, without knowing, vnderstanding, and comprehending them? To receiue them without knowing any thing in them, is to receiue them without fruite. Or if they will haue the people to haue knowledge in the Scriptures, whether they will haue them to discerne them, and learning them, that they may be instructed with iudgement & discretion? The other, why they will not haue the people to iudge and discerne that the bookes of the Scripture are sacred and diuine, and not in the meane time

they will haue them to know and diſcerne the true Church, to diſtinguiſh it from the falſe? To diſcerne the true Church from the falſe, is it not requiſite that euery Chriſtian ſhould be particularly aſſiſted, and inwardly conducted by the Spirit of God? If it be ſo, why will they not haue euery faithfull Chriſtian to haue need of the ſame aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, to diſcerne the word of God from the word of men? If for an euaſion they ſay, that to know certainly which is the othodoxall and pure Church, there is no need of the aide and aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God; do they not make their religion prophane, and ſhew it to be led by opinion, cuſtome, and humane reaſon?

In the meane time, all being well weighed and conſidered, it will be found that the ſame iudgement of diſcretion, which God giueth to the faithfull to diſcerne the Word of God from the word of men, is the ſame iudgement whereby we diſcerne the true Church from the falſe; becauſe that is the true Church, which beleeueth and teacheth the true word of God. Whoſoeuer ſaith, that the people ought to diſcerne the true Church without diſcerning the true word of God, ſpeaketh things contradicting one the other, and doth like one that would haue men to know who are iuſt, without knowing the rule of righteouſneſſe.

ARNOVX.

8. Section. *Paſſages quoted in the margent of the Confeſſion. Pſal. 12. 6. The words of the Lord are pure words, as ſiluer tried in a fornace of earth, purified ſeuen times. Pſal. 19. 7. 8. The Law of God is perfect, conuerting the ſoule; the teſtimonie of the Lord is ſure, making wiſe the ſimple; the ſtatutes of the Lord are right, reioycing the heart; the commandement of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. Not one of theſe paſſages do contains one onely word of them, in confirmation whereof they are alledged: which is, that it appertaineth to the members of the Church, rather then to all the Church, to diſcerne the true Scriptures from the falſe. If they be alledged as an elogie and recommendation of the Word of God, whereof there is no queſtion, it is a deceiuing of the reader, that perſuadeth*

foundeth himselfe, that they are quoted for a proofe of that which is in controuersie, and whereof hereafter we alter proofe then in the margent.

MOVLIN.

These two passages are not quoted in the margent, to proue a thing that we beleeue not, & which M. *Arnoux* falsely attributeth vnto vs, that is, that it belongeth to the particular members of the Church, rather then to the whole body of the Church, to discerne the true from the false Scriptures. These passages serue nor to proue that: they are employed to proue these words of the article of our Confession; which is, that *those canonicall books are a most certaine rule of our faith*: which is a point in controuersie betweene vs and our aduersaries, that accuse the holy Scriptures to be insufficient and obscure, calling it a piece or part of a rule, and a two-handed sword, as we shall hereafter see. And what hurt is there done to alledge these passages vpon things that are not in controuersie? Can we not instruct without disputing?

A delphick sword, or a sword for both hands.

ARNOVX.

Of the interpretation of the Scriptures, and whether the Church of Rome is an infallible interpreter, and whether it belongs to euery particular person to interpret the Scriptures.

Contrarie passages. Saint Peter in his second Epistle, Chap. 1. 6. Sect.
20. No propheſie of the Scripture is of any priuate interpretation. *Therefore it is contrary to the Apostolicke commandement, that euery one of you should take vpon him to iudge the true sence and vnderstanding of the Scriptures. The interpreter hath his manner of interpretation, and assureth himselfe to be iudge by a particular spirit, and for a foundation of all that which he shall deliuer, layeth this presumptuous and prohibited assurance.*

MOVLIN.

The passage of Saint *Peter* is not contrary to the article of

our Confession. S. Peter in this passage reiecteth particular interpretations: but in the fourth article of our Confession, there is nothing said of interpretation, nor of the sence or intelligence of the Scripture. This man doth not vnderstand himselfe. And to what purpose should he impugne particular interpretations, seeing that we also condemne them? For it is so farre from vs to receiue the interpretation of a particular man for lawes, that we receiue not the interpretations of a particular Church, how great so euer it be, when such interpretations are giuen for infallible rules, and are equalized in authoritie with the holy Scriptures, as the interpretations of the Pope and of the Romish Church are.

It is true, that in our Sermons we interpret the Scriptures, but we giue not our interpretations for lawes: and alledge no other interpretations of the Scriptures, then those which the Scriptures themselues affoord. Whereby it is not our interpretation, but that which God himselfe giueth.

But this requireth a little more discourse, to let you see wherein our interpretations differ from those of the Romish Church: wherein there are fiue notable differences.

1. The first is, that the interpretatiõs of the Scripture which we bring, are drawn out of the Scripture it selfe: But the Romish Church draweth the most part of her interpretations from an vnwritte word, and from traditions. Thus when the Word saith, *Thou shalt worship one onely God, and him onely shalt thou serue*, the Church of Rome vnderstandeth, that the adoration Latria is here onely reserued vnto God, but that the same hindreth not men from adoring Saints, Images, and the relickes with the adoratiõ of Dulia. But the Scripture speaketh not of this adoration of Dulia giuen vnto creatures. So when the Apostle in the ninth Chapter and tenth verse to the Hebrewes so often inserteth, *That as it is appointed vnto all men, that they shall once die, so Christ was once offered to take away the sinnes of many, and that by the offering once made he hath sanctified vs*: the Romish Church vnderstandeth, that he speaketh there of the bloudy sacrifice; & say, that besides that sacrifice, there is another sacrifice of the body of Christ which is not bloudy,

bloody, that is, the Masse: but the Scripture speaketh not of this sacrifice of the body of our Lord without bloud. So, when Iesus Christ said vnto Saint *Peter*, *Feede my sheepe*, the church of Rome vnderstandeth that to be said to *Peter*, and to his successours in the charge of the head of the vniuersall Church, which are the Popes of Rome. But the Scripture saith not, that Saint *Peter* should haue successors in his Apostolicall place, as the other Apostles also haue had none; and saith not that his successors should be Bishops of Rome. I could produce an infinite number of such examples.

2. The second difference is, that when we draw an interpretation of a passage in the Scripture, out of the Scripture, we exhort the people to looke into the place, and to reade the Scripture, that euery man may know whether we alledge it truly and proceed sincerily therein, according to the example of those of *Berœa*, in the seuenteenth of the *Acts*, who after they had heard the Apostle *Paul*, went to conferre his words with the Scripture, to know whether it were so, or not. On the contrary, the Doctors of the Romish Church, interpreting the Scripture to the people, will not haue them to consult with the Scriptures, which in those places where the Pope is absolutely obeyed, is a booke wholly prohibited to the people. And in Spaine or Italie, if any Italian or Spanish Bible be found in any Lay mans hands, it is a crime deseruing burning, and an Inquisition case.

3. The third difference is, That we giue not our interpretations for lawes, as if we were infallible interpreters, neither make we our selues iudges of the holy Scriptures. For we say, that in the cleare passages of the Scriptures that haue no need of interpretations, all that which is necessary for our saluation is contained. On the contrary, the Church of Rome attributeth vnto her selfe, the power to be an infallible Iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, and of giuing interpretations that are of equall authority and force with the holy Scriptures. A prodigious thing, that sinners and guilty persons will take vpon them to be infallible Iudges of the sence of the lawes which concerne their crimes and offences:

That

That sinfull mē should be Iudges of that Word, by the which at the latter day they shall be iudged. And whereas our senses and our wils ought to be subiected to the word of God, that the Word of God should be subiected to the sence and meaning of men. That Maister is like to be well serued, whose seruants be the interpreters of his commandements, and thinke it lawfull for them to say to their maister, Thou hast commanded vs to do thus, but we iudge that it ought thus to be vnderstood. This is to subiect religion vnto men, whereas men should be subiects to religion. Certainly, no man but the King can giue interpretations to the Kings proclamations and precepts, that should be of equall force and authoritie with the Kings Edict. None but God can bring interpretations to the Word of God, which are of as much force and authoritie as the word of God is. I say, if there be any Prelates that are infallible interpreters of the word of God, and that vpon the sence of the Scriptures pronounce irreuocable decrees, that such Pastors haue much more authority then the law of God; because the people are not bound to follow the words of the law, but the interpretation of those Prelates. It were better to be an interpreter in this maner, then to be a law-giuer: and it is impossible that such an interpreter should be subiect to the law. For it is fit that he should be without sinne, lest he should make his interpretations of the law, couertures and cloakes of his sinne.

Therein, besides the impietie, the absurditie is most manifest; for, before that men should giue the Church of Rome the authority of an infallible Iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, it is necessary to be first assured that it is sound, and of a good iudgement in faith. Into the which iudgement if we enter by the holy Scripture, then the Church of Rome is subiected to be iudged by the Scriptures. Or if to know whether the Church of Rome be pure in faith, we must referre our selues to the testimonie of the Church of Rome it selfe, then she is Iudge in her owne cause, and she will be sure not to condemne her selfe. So, when question is made, to know what the duty of the Church is: it is in this question

the

the Church be Iudge, she is both Iudge and partie, and will haue no other lawes but those which she her selfe will make and ordaine. And seeing that in the interpretation of the Scriptures, the Grek, Syrian, Affricane and Roman Churches are different, how shall a simple artificer know which interpretation is best; seeing the other Churches are ancienter then the Romane, and boast of Saint *Peters* chaire, and of diuers Apostles? We must therefore come to this point, that if they vnderstand the word *Iudge*, to signifie *Discerning*, (as when we iudge of meates by the taste,) euery faithfull person ought to pray vnto God for grace to iudge, to discerne, and to know the true sence of the Scripture. But if by *Iudging*, they vnderstand to pronounce decrees, and definitiue and infallible iudgements, touching the sence of the Scriptures, thereby to bind other mens consciences, there is no man in the world that hath that power. That which is cleare and manifest in the Scripture, hauing no need of interpretation, is sufficient to saluation: or if there be any obscure places, they are clearely expounded elsewhere. And if there be any passages that are obscure, and cannot be vnderstood by other passages, it is better to be ignorant therein, then to play the interpreter with authority of a Iudge. For, for this cause God thought it requisite, that in his word there should be some places that are obscure among a great number of cleare and manifest places; that by those that are cleare, he might instruct our ignorance, and by the obscure, proue our sobrietie and temperance.

4. The fourth difference betweene the Interpretations that we make of the Scriptures, and those of the Romish church, is, That they neuer as yet accused vs of wresting the Scripture for our owne profit, nor to haue giuen it a sence which serueth to make vs rich, or to aduance vs to worldly dignities; which is one of the great mischiefes in the church of Rome. Couetousnesse and Ambition, that are ingenious to wrest and racke the Scriptures, haue found out and inuented admirable interpretations. In the first Tome of the Councels there is a Decree attributed to *Anacletus*, which saith, that

Peter

Cephas, id eſt, caput & principium Apoſtolatus.

Peter is *Cephas*, that is to ſay, Chiefe or Head, and holding the principall place among the Apoſtles. In the ninth Seſſion of the laſt Councell of Lateran, the ſeuenty one Pſalme is alledged, where it is ſaid, *All Kings ſhall fall downe before him, and all nations ſhall ſerue him*; as if it were ſpoken of the Pope. And a little after, that is attributed to the Pope which Ieſus Chriſt ſaith in the 28. chapter of Saint *Matthew*, *All power is giuen vnto me in heauen and in earth.* Pope *Boniface* the eighth in the Extrauagant *Vnam Sanctam*, ſheweth, that all the world ought to be ſubiect to the Pope, becauſe in the tenth of *Iohn* it is written, *There ſhall be one ſhéepfold and one ſhepheard.* There alſo he proueth the ſuperioritie of the Pope, by that which is written, *In the beginning God created heauen and earth*: For, ſaith he, there is, *in principio*, in the ſingular number, and not *in principiis*, in the plurall number, which is a notable obſeruation. There he proueth, that both the Swords are in the Popes power, that is, both the Spirituall and the Temporall, becauſe that in the 22. of Saint *Luke*, the Apoſtles hauing ſaid, *Lord, behold, here are two Swords*, they ſaid vnto them, *It is enough.* To the ſame end he applieth that which God ſaid to *Ieremie*, chap. 1. *See, I haue this day ſet thee ouer the nations, and ouer the Kingdomes.* *Bellarmine* in his booke againſt *Barkley*, proueth the power of the Pope to depoſe Kings, by that which is ſaid to Saint *Peter*, *Feede my ſheepe*: alſo by that, that Saint *Paul* will haue *thoſe that preach the Goſpell, to liue of the Goſpell.* *Kill and eate*, alledged by *Baronius*, applied to moue and incite the Pope to thunder againſt and to perſecute the Venetians, is a ridiculous manner of interpreting the Scriptures. I could alledge a thouſand ſuch like interpretations, which are as many confeſſions of a bad cauſe, ſeeing it cannot be defended but by wreſted paſſages, and violent and raſh interpretations of the Scriptures. Therefore the church of Rome vſurpeth the title of an infallible Iudge of the ſence of the Scriptures, to the end that where reaſon wanteth, it may be ſupplied by authority: for ſuch proofees haue no force, but onely by the authority of him that propoundeth them.

It is the 72. in the Hebrew.

5 The

5. The fifth and last difference is, that we cannot be charged nor accused to make prophane and ridiculous interpretations, thereby to expose the holy Scriptures to be laughed at, as the Church of Rome doth. The second Councell of Nice, which our Aduersaries place among the vniuersall Councels, vpon paine of cursing and excommunication commandeth the adoration of Images, and saith, *that they are of as much estimation as the Gospell.* Now to proue this detestable doctrine, the Fathers of that Councell produce diuers passages of the Scriptures, with a strange compasse, and extrauagant subtiltie: and because the Iconoclastians mocked at those allegations, Pope *Adrian* the first expressely made a booke, and dedicated the same to *Charlemaine*, which is found at the end of the said Councell, whereby he maintaineth all those passages to be well alledged. The Fathers of that Councell, for the adoration of Images, had alledged this passage in the second of the Canticles: *Let me see thy countenance, let me heare thy voice.* And *God created man in his owne image & likenesse*, Gen. 1. Also *that Abraham worshipped the Hethites*, Gen. 23. *That Moses worshipped Iethro his father in law*, Exod. 18. *That Iacob blessed Pharao*, Genesis 47. And, *No man when he hath lighted a candle, couereth it vnder a bushell*, Luke 8. 16. Pope *Adrian* defendeth these passages, saying, *Recte illud protulerunt*: They haue truly alledged them, *& valde nimis atque pulchrè contra eos qui Imagines contemnunt, dixerunt peni lucernam sub modio.* They haue spoken excellent well, and with a good grace, against those that contemne Images, that they set a Lampe vnder a bushell. What man is he that hath any free or common sence, that wil not detest such prophanation of the Scriptures? and yet these are the interpretations of the Church; it is a Councell that speaketh, and a Pope that defendeth this Councell.

Tom. 3. Concil. Editionis Colon. pa. 205.

He that desireth to see the horrible prophanation of the passages of the Scripture alledged in manner of a iest, let him reade those that write of the mysteries of the Masse, and of the ceremonies of the Romish Church: as *Innocent* the third, of the mysteries of the Masse; The booke of sacred Ceremonies: *Durants* Rationall: *Tolet* of the instruction of Priests:

Title-

Tuleman, &c. and there he ſhall finde the Scriptures moſt ridiculouſly wreſted. They ſay, that the Altar muſt be of ſtone, becauſe it is ſaid, *Petra erat Chriſtus*: That Tapers are ſet vpon the Altar, becauſe it is written, *I am the light of the world*: That the Prieſt kiſſeth the Altar, becauſe in the Canticles it is written, *Let him kiſſe me with the kiſſe of his mouth*: That the Prieſt turneth his backe to the people, becauſe it is written; *Thou ſhalt ſee my backe parts*, Exodus. 33. 23. That the Clarke that ſerueth the Prieſt, moueth and ſtirreth his body as the Prieſt doth, becauſe it is written, *Where I am, there alſo my ſeruant ſhall be*. That the Prieſt waſheth his hands twice, becauſe it is written, *Amplius lauame*, Pſalme 51. That the Biſhop at Maſſe changeth his hoſe and his ſhooes, becauſe it is written, *Put off thy ſhooes, for the place is holy*, Ex. 3. 5. With the like ſubtiltie the Pope at this day, when he is crowned, caſteth certaine copper money among the people, ſaying, *Siluer and gold haue I none, but that which I haue, I giue thee.* Where religion is changed into a Comedie, it is no maruell that the Scriptures are expoſed vnto laughter, and turned into a ridiculous ſence. Thus much touching the interpretation which father *Arnoux* ſaith to be receiued from the hand of Gods ſpouſe, that is (as he vnderſtands it) the Church of Rome. Thus you may ſee how the word of God is dexterouſly alledged, and God worthily ſerued.

Whether the Church may erre: and whether the Church of Rome hath erred.

10. *Sect.* All this abuſe is grounded vpon this ſuppoſition, that the Church cannot erre: that is, that the Church being aſſembled to decide matters of faith, cannot erre. A propoſition, which being well weighed and conſidered, will be found to be raſh, without reaſon and apparence, and by experience contradicted.

For if by the Church, our aduerſaries vnderſtand the Church of the elect predeſtinated to ſaluation, which S. *Peter* in

in his first Epistle, chap. 2. calleth *a chosen generation*, and which the Apostle to the Hebrewes, chap. 12. calleth, *The assemblie and congregation of the first borne which are written in heauen*: it is a great absurditie to aske, if the Church assembled to iudge the difference of religion may erre, seeing that it neuer assembleth to decide any point of faith.

If by the word *Church*, they vnderstand the vniuersall visible Church, which is the assembly of all those that make profession to be Christians, it is no lesse absurd, to aske if that Church assembled to iudge the points of faith can erre, seeing that now it is impossible for the same to be assembled: for it is composed of discordāt parts, that is, of the Greeke, the Romane, the Syrian, and the African Churches, &c. which are particular Churches separated from communion. For who shall assemble them? who shall set them at agreement? who shall be arbitrator of their discord? who shall be president in that assemblie? seeing that euery one of them attributeth vnto her selfe the perfections & testimonies which God giueth to his Church in his word.

But if by the word *Church*, our aduersaries vnderstand a particular Church, as that of Rome, of Antioch, or of Constantinople, they themselues confesse, that euery particular Church may erre: and say that the Church of Ierusalem founded by Iesus Christ, and that of Antioch founded by *Peter* erred.

The holy Historie witnesseth, that the Church of Israel, which vnder the old Testament was the onely Church in the world, oftentimes erred. It was idolatrous in Egypt, Ezech. 20. 7, 8. The people in the desart worshipped the golden Calfe, to the which also *Aaron* the high Priest erected an Altar, and proclaimed a solemne feast vnto it, Exod. 32. *Uriah* the high Priest erected a Pagan altar in the temple of God, 2. Kings 16. In the fifteenth Chapter of the second of Chronicles it is said, *Now for a long season Israel hath bene without the true God, and without a teaching Priest, and without Law.* Which cannot be vnderstood of the ten Tribes that reuolted from the couenant of God; for that a little after he addeth:

that

that they turned againe vnto God, but those ten Tribes neuer turned. *Ieremie* in cap. 2. 27, 28. reprocheth the Church of Iuda, that it had had as many gods as townes; & that the Kings, Priests, and Prophets said vnto the woods, Thou art my father, which is the language of idolaters. He maketh the like complaints, cap. 5. 31. and cap. 6. 14. And *Isay* cap. 56. saith, *All thy watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant, they cannot barke:* It is hard to maintaine that the high Priests, Scribes, and Pharises, that held *Moses* chaire and the ordinary succession, did not erre in the faith, when being assembled they decreed, that *whosoeuer did confesse Iesus to be Christ, should be cast out of the Synagogue*, Iohn 9. 22. Which is one of the causes (among many others) for the which Iesus Christ warneth his disciples to beware of the leauen of the doctrine of the Pharises, in the sixteenth of S. *Mathew*: whose instructions Iesus Christ would haue the Iewes wholly to obserue when they preached in *Moses* chaire, but not when they preached against *Moses*, and against the Law; for that is not a succession, but an ouerthrowing of the chaire and the doctrine. Among whom *Caiphas* the high Priest and head of that succession, iudged that Iesus Christ was a blasphemer and worthy of death, Math. 26. Then, when the said prelate in the eleuenth of S. *Iohn*, prophesied that one man was to die for the whole nation, he did not prophesie because the infallible truth was fixed to his chaire, but God inspired him extraordinarily, to the end that that prophesie whereby the price and the vertue of the death of Iesus Christ is declared, might be of more weight and authority among the Iewes, in regard of the quality of the person.

Matth. 16.

If the Church then which was the onely Church in the world, and the Pastors that onely held the chaire, erred, is it credible, that when the Church is deuided into contrarie Churches, and into chaires separated from communion, one particular Church may or can presume not to erre, and to subiect all others to her will? and that without producing her priuiledges? and contrary to the experience of so many ages, and the iudgement of all antiquitie?

The

The first Councell held in Constantinople, in the thirteenth Canon condemneth the Church of Rome by name, because she reiected married Priests; & in the fiue and fiftieth Canon because she fasted on the Saturday. Those fathers then beleeued that the Church of Rome could erre. The Greeke and the Romane Churches ioyned together in the second Councell of Nice, did they not erre, when in that Councell they decreed, vpon paine of cursing and excommunication, that images ought to be adored, and that they are of as much estimation as the Gospell, and that the image is better then the word, where, in the tradition it is said: *Maior est imago quàm oratio?*

And after the death of Pope *Formosus*, so many times vnburied by his successors and drawne about the towne, and after laid honourably in the graue againe; how many contrary Councels, (wherein the Popes were presidents) were there, that allowed and disallowed the decrees and ordinances of precedent Councels? And you must note, that then there was a question about a point of doctrine, which was, whether the Pope may dispence with and oath made to God, and whether he ought to be held to be a lawfull Pope, that had receiued the Papacie contrary to the oath which he had made neuer to take it on him. Platina. Stella. Anastasius. Luitprandus. Sigibert, &c.

Did not the Church of Rome erre in the Councell of Rome holden vnder *Gregorie* the seuenth, anno 1076, where it was declared and defined, that there was *no other name vnder the heauens but that of the Pope?* and that *no booke is canonicall without his authority*, and that *all Kings ought to kisse his feete?* Baron Annal. anno 1076.

Did not the Church of Rome erre in the Councell of Latran vnder *Innocent* the third, where power is giuen to the Pope to dispossesse and driue Princes that are excommunicate, out of their lands and Signiories? cap. 3.

Or in the Councell of Constance holden anno 1414. where she declared, that we must neither obserue faith nor promise with hetetickes, and that it is lawfull to put them to death after safe conduct is giuen them? And that to haue the peo-

ple to receiue the Sacrament vnder both kinds, following the example of Ieſus Chriſt and the ancient Church, is raſhneſſe, and an hereſie puniſhable by the ſecular power?

Or in the Councell of Florence, holden anno 1440: where it is decreed that the Pope may adde to the Creed?

Or in the laſt Councell of Latran, where the holy Scriptures were laid at the Popes feet, and he called a King much like vnto God? where alſo it is ſaid, that all people ought to adore him: that he hath all power both in heauen and earth, that he is the Lyon of Iuda, the Roote of *Dauid*, the Sauiour of Sion, and the diuine Maieſtie?

Laſtly, ſhall the Church of Rome continue pure and entire, then when (according to the opinion of our aduerſaries) Antichriſt ſhall aboliſh the Maſſe? or at the time whereof Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh, Luke 18. *Thinke you when the Sonne of man commeth, that he ſhall find faith on the earth?*

To be ſhort, to ſay that ſhe cannot erre, is a language that onely belongeth vnto God, or to him that maketh himſelfe to be God, whom Saint *Paul* calleth the Sonne of perdition. 2. Theſſ. 2. The Apoſtles neuer bragged that they could not erre, notwithſtanding that the Spirit of God guided them in all truth. Whoſoeuer ſaith, I cannot fall by ignorance, is partly fallen by pride: whoſoeuer ſaith I cannot erre in the interpretation of the Scriptures, makes himſelfe infallible Iudge of that doctrine by the which one day he ſhall be iudged. He that is fallen, ſhall neuer riſe againe, as long as he preſumeth that he ſtandeth. He will not be ſubiect to any rule, as long as he thinketh himſelfe to be the rule: and there is no riches nor dignity whatſoeuer vpon earth, whereunto he wil not aſpire, ſeeing that no man may contradict him. By this meanes the Scripture will be held and eſteemed to be of little neceſſitie: for what need I ſtudie, if a man that cannot erre leadeth me directly vnto heauen? If God, to the end that the people ſhould not be ſeduced, hath giuen thoſe Prelates the vertue not to erre, it is wonder that he did not likewiſe giue them the vertue neuer to be vicious, ſeeing that nothing cauſeth Atheiſme ſooner to breed among the people, then the pro-

phane.

phane liues of Paſtors, whereof being conuinced, it maketh the doctrine cõtemptible. The Canon, *Si Papa*, in the fortieth Diſtinction teacheth vs that in moſt expreſſe termes, which ſaith: *If the Pope being negligent of his owne ſaluation, and of the ſaluation of his brethren, vnprofitable and ſlacke in his buſineſſe, and beſides that doing no good, in the meane time he leadeth after him, being himſelfe firſt a bondſlaue of ſinne, innumerable multitudes of people into perdition, to be tormented with him by many plagues: let no man preſume to reprehend him for the ſame, becauſe the that ſhould iudge all men, ought not to be iudged by any man, if he be not found to haue erred from the faith.* This ſpeech certainely is diabolicall: and yet he that to flatter the Pope hath vomited out ſo many impieties, freely acknowledgeth that the Pope may erre from the faith. Whereupon I am, and haue oftentimes bene abaſhed, wherefore the Pope that vanteth that he cannot erre in the deciding of doubts, abſtaineth (now many yeeres paſt) from pronouncing any definitiue ſentence vpon the controuerſie which is in the Church of Rome, about the queſtions of freewill and predeſtination: for the which the Iacobins and the Ieſuites in Spaine are at continuall ſtrife.

The props wherewith they ſupport this proud doctrine, are ſo weake, that if you blow vpon them, they are ready to fall. They alledge vnto vs, that it is ſaid in the ſecond chapter of Malachie: *For the Prieſts lips ſhould keepe knowledge, and they ſhould ſeeke the Law at his mouth, for he is the meſſenger of the Lord of hoſts.* But it is a great abuſe to make a promiſe of that which is a cõmandement. And indeed thoſe Prieſts of whom it is here ſpoken, ſeduced the people, and corrupted the couenant, as it is ſaid in the next verſe.

They alſo alledge, that Ieſus Chriſt in the ſixteenth of Saint Matthew, promiſed that the gates of hell ſhould not preuaile againſt the Church: but there he ſpeakes not of any particular Church, nor of Rome, neither yet of the vniuerſall viſible Church; which although the power of the diuell cannot vtterly aboliſh it, yet he often preuaileth againſt it diuers wayes, corrupting ſome by vices, ſeducing others by hereſies,

and diſſipating many particular Churches by perſecution. *The beaſt ſhall make warre with the Saints, and ouercome them*, Apoc. 13. The Church flieth before the red Dragon, Apoc. 12. In that paſſage our Sauiour ſpeaketh of the Church of the elect, which cannot be ſeduced, nor depriued of ſaluation by the temptations of the diuell, as Ieſus Chriſt teacheth in the 13. of Saint *Marke*, ſaying: *For falſe Chriſts ſhall ariſe, and falſe Prophets, and ſhall ſhew ſignes and wonders to deceiue, if it were poſſible, the very elect.* Where, if he ſpeake of the vniuerſall viſible Church, his meaning is that Satan can neuer aboliſh it.

But ſpecially our aduerſaries make ſhew of the 15. verſe of the third chapter of the firſt to *Timothie*, where the Church is called *the houſe of God, the pillar and ground of truth.* The abuſe conſiſts herein, that they take that which is but a deſcription of her dutie, to be an infallible perfection of the Church. The Apoſtle thereby teacheth vs, that the Church is eſtabliſhed in this world to defend and ſupport the truth; but ſaith not, that ſhe cannot faile in her dutie. So falſe Churches are pillars and grounds of lies, but it followeth not from thence, that they can neuer turne to the truth. To thinke or eſteeme that the truth of God is grounded vpon men, is to make mans authoritie firmer then Gods truth. On the contrary, the Apoſtle to the Epheſians the ſecond chapter, ſaith, that *we are built vpon the foundation of the Prophets and Apoſtles*: not vpon them as they were mortall men, but vpon their doctrine which endureth for euer. So the ancient Fathers vnderſtād it. *Chryſoſtome* in the eleuenth homilie vpon the firſt to *Timothy* ſaith, *The truth is the pillar and ground of the Church.* And *Ireneus* in the firſt chapter of his third booke ſaith, *They haue left vs the Goſpell in the Scriptures to be a pillar and ground of our faith.*

ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθειά ἐστι ἐκκλησίας κ) στύλος κ) ἑδραίωμα.
Euangelium in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtræ futurum.

Our aduerſaries themſelues ſay it without thinking thereon, as often as they ground the authority of the Church vpon this and other ſuch like places: for thereby they ſilently confeſſe, that the authoritie of the Church is grounded vpon the Scriptures, and ſo (not knowing it) diſpute againſt themſelues. And it is certaine, that whoſoeuer groundeth the authority

thority of the Scriptures vpon the authority of the Church, bereaueth the Church of the meanes to ground her authoritie vpon the Scriptures, and neuer ought to alledge the Scripture for a ground of the Church. He that buildeth the walles vpo the foundation, ſuppoſeth that the foundation is not grounded vpon the walles: So if the Church be the foundation of the word of God, it is not grounded vpon the word of God. Why then do they ground the authority of the Romane Church vpon this paſſage?

Now after all this, if it were granted vnto them that the word of God is grounded vpon the Church, they haue gotten nothing, if they do not alſo proue that this Church is the Romane rather then the Greeke or Syrian Churches, which are ancienter then the Romane, and purer, and alſo boaſt of the ſucceſſion of Saint *Peter*.

They alſo to the ſame end apply the words of our Lord in the ſixteenth of Saint *Iohn*, verſe 13. *Howbeit when he is come, which is the Spirit of truth, he will leade you into all truth.* This promiſe properly belongeth to the Apoſtles, whereof they haue receiued the full accompliſhment vpon the day of Pentecoſt, when the holy Ghoſt deſcended vpon them and taught them all the truth of the doctrine of ſaluation. And abeit this promiſe ſhould apperraine vnto the Church, and ſhould be perpetuall to all ages, yet the infallibleneſſe of the Church is not thereby proued, muuh leſſe the infallibleneſſe of any particular Church.

They alſo alledge the paſſage of the eighteenth of S. *Matthew*: *If thy brother treſpaſſe againſt thee, tell it vnto the Church; and if he refuſe to heare the Church, let him be vnto thee as an heathen man or a Publican*: But this place ſhall be examined hereafter when M. *Arnoux* obiects it againſt vs.

For the infallibleneſſe of the Romiſh Church they alledge that Ieſus Chriſt ſaid to S. *Peter*, Luke 32. 31. *Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath deſired you, to winnow you as wheate, but I haue prayed for thee that thy faith faile not.* Marke that two lines after he foreſheweth to *Peter* that he ſhould deny him 3. times. Whence it appeareth, that by thoſe words Ieſus pre-

pareth him againſt the temptation, and promiſeth not to forſake him, nor to ſuffer his faith to faile. Which is euident, for that by the word *faith*, he vnderſtandeth not the doctrine, but the truſt and confidence in Ieſus Chriſt: and by the word *faile*, he vnderſtandeth not to erre in doctrine, but to faile by weakeneſſe. But what makes that for the Romiſh Church? doth all that is ſaid to S. *Peter*, or that is ſaid by S. *Peter*, belong to the Pope? as, *Go behind me, Satan*: and *Siluer and gold haue I none*, &c. or when Ieſus Chriſt ſent *Peter* with his companions to preach without ſcrip, money, or any prouiſion? Luke 9.

Math. 16. Acts. 3.

ARNOVX.

11. Sect. *Alſo to the Galatians 2. 1. Then fourteene yeeres after I went vp againe to Ieruſalem with Barnabas, and tooke with me Titus alſo, and I went vp by reuelation, and declared to them that Goſpell which I preached among the Gentiles: but particularly to them that were the chiefe, leſt by any meanes I ſhould run, or had run in vaine. Behold alſo S. Paul, as well as S. Peter, who formally both by example and words condemne the interior perſwaſion of the holy Ghoſt. He receiued his Goſpell from the Sonne of God, and is well aſſured that it is canonicall; neuertheleſſe he taketh not that for a rule, that the holy Spirit truly perſwadeth him thereunto, but rather the iudgement of the Apoſtolicke colledge, and had a reuelation that he ſhould go vnto them, and feareth to run in vaine if he doth it not.*

MOVLIN.

It is falſe that in this place Saint *Paul* condemneth the interior perſwaſion of the holy Ghoſt, and I am abaſht how it is poſſible that a man which maketh profeſſion to teach Diuinitie, dares deny that Saint *Paul* was led by an interior perſwaſion of the holy Ghoſt. For in Acts 13. 9. it is ſaid, that *Paul* was filled with the holy Ghoſt: and a little before in the paſſage which M. *Arnoux* alledgeth, the Apoſtle ſaith, that he had receiued the Goſpell by reuelation from Ieſus Chriſt; which could not be, vnleſſe Ieſus Chriſt inwardly touched his heart by his holy Spirit, therein to imprint the doctrine of ſaluation. Saint *Peter* in the firſt chapter of his firſt Epiſtle

Gal. 1. 12.

faith,

ſaith, that the Apoſtles preached the Goſpell by the power of the holy Ghoſt. In the ſixteenth of the Acts the holy Ghoſt forbiddeth S. *Paul* to preach the Goſpel in Aſia. And if S. *Paul* tooke not the perſwaſion of the holy Ghoſt for a rule, but accepted the iudgement of the Apoſtolicke colledge, we muſt ſay, that he preached three yeeres without rule, ſeeing that he had no conference with any of the Apoſtles till three yeeres after his conuerſion, Gal. 1. 17, 18. where S. *Paul* ſaith, that when it pleaſed God to reueale his Sonne vnto him, he returned not againe vnto Ieruſalem to thoſe that had bene Apoſtles before him, but went into Arabia. Three yeeres after he went to Ieruſalem to conferre with the Apoſtles, not to receiue or take any rule which he had not before, but to the end that this conference might be a publicke profeſſion of concordance, without the which he and the other Apoſtles had runne in vaine, and their labour had bene fruitleſſe. Not that I am of opinion that any man at this day may take Saint *Pauls* example therein for a rule, to diſpence with himſelfe for a certaine time from conferring and communicating with his brethren, vnder pretence or ſhadow of particular inſpiration: for Saint *Paul* had gifts and prerogatiues, which no man at this day may vſurpe without great preſumption.

ARNOVX.

To be ſhort, is it poſſible that the Spirit of God ſhould be more 12. Sect.
aſſuredly in the heart of euery particular perſon, then in the whole Church wherein it reſideth, and worketh this common agreement and conſent?

MOVLIN.

The aduerſarie in theſe words makes vs ſay that which we do not beleeue. Let thoſe that beleeue it anſwer him: & in the meane time let him procure thoſe parties whereof the vniuerſal viſible Church at this day is cõpoſed, as the Greek, the Syrian, the Affrican, and the Romane Churches, to agree together, before they can pronunce an aſſured and true iudge-

ment. And for the reſt, no man denieth that in an orthodox-all Church we muſt giue more credit to the iudgement of the Paſtors and Miniſters aſſembled together, then to a particular mans iudgement.

THE FIFTH ARTICLE.

Of the Confeſsion of the Faith.

Of the perfection of the Scriptures, and of Traditions.

We beleeue that the Word contained in thoſe bookes, proceedeth from God, from whom onely it hath authoritie, and not from men. And for that it is the rule of all truth, containing all that which is neceſſary for the ſeruice of God and our ſaluation, it is not lawfull for men, no nor for Angels, to adde vnto, diminiſh from, or to change the ſame. From whence it followeth, that neither antiquity, cuſtome, multitude, wiſedome of men, iudgements, ſentences, edicts, decrees, Councels, viſions, nor miracles, ought to be oppoſed againſt the ſame holy Scripture; but on the contrary, all things ought to be examined, regulated, and reformed by the ſame: and therefore we allow the three ſymboles, the Creed of the Apoſtles, of *Nice*, and of *Athanaſius*, becauſe they are conformable to the Word of God.

ARNOVX.

13. Sect. *This vtterly excludeth the vnwritten word of God, which we call traditions, & induceth vs to beleeue nothing at all but that only which is diſtinctly contained and ſet downe in the Scriptures; and*

to make vs renounce and reiect all Antiquitie, Councels, decisions, interpretations of Doctours, obseruations and customes of the Church; and to prepare and make vs docible to all the glosses which a Minister shall make vpon the Scripture according to his particular sence. To be short, it is not strictly to obserue the Scriptures, but by their proper sences and glosses to couer and defend themselues against the sence of the Church, which onely can deliuer vnto vs both the letter and the sence of the holy Scripture, whereof she is the inheritrix.

MOVLIN.

Will this man neuer deliuer nor set downe our Beliefe truly? For in all this speech, all what soeuer he alledgeth to be said by vs, is cleane contrary to that which we beleeue, and is contained in this fifth article. It is false, that we beleeue nothing but that which is distinctly set downe in the holy Scriptures: for we beleeue many things which are not found distinctly nor in so many words in the Scripture, but are therein set downe in equiualent words, and by consequence necessary: As that the Church of God shall continue for euer: That God by his prouidence gouerneth all things: That in the diuine essence there is a Trinitie of persons: and diuers such propositions which are easily proued by the Scriptures, although they are not found there in so many precise words: In the same manner that *Apollos* proued by the Scripture, that Iesus was that Christ, although it be not distinctly and in so many syllables found therein. For if we must receiue no more but that which is distinctly in so many words contained in the Scripture, no man should be bound to beleeue in Iesus Christ: for in the Scripture it is not said, that *Charles* or *Henry* ought to beleeue in Iesus Christ: onely there all men are commanded to beleeue in Iesus Christ. From whence the dutie of particular men to beleeue in Iesus Christ, by consequence is drawne. It is false, that by this fifth Article we renounce all Antiquitie and Councels; for we onely say, that neither Antiquitie nor Councels ought to be opposed against the Scripture. It is false, that we would establish the glosses and interpretations of any particular Minister, as we haue shewed in Acts 18.

the

the ſeuenth and ninth Section.

Laſtly, it is falſe that we reiect Traditions, ſeeing that the Scripture it ſelfe is a Tradition: and that there are many things which concerne Eccleſiaſticall policy and exterior order, which are not ſpecified in the Scripture. We onely reiect thoſe traditions, which being receiued, it would thereupon follow, that the Scripture containeth not all the doctrine which is neceſſary to ſaluation.

Such is the vnwritten word, whereunto our aduerſaries haue recourſe when the Scripture faileth them; and that heape of humane traditions, which are equalized in authority with the holy Scriptures, which we affirme to be the rule of all truth, and to containe all that which is neceſſary to ſaluation, and proue it by theſe paſſages. Saint *Paul* in the third chapter of the ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothie*, verſe 15. ſpeaketh thus vnto his diſciple, ſaying: *From thy infancy thou haſt knowne the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wiſe vnto ſaluation, through the faith which is in Ieſus Chriſt.* Then the holy Scriptures containe all that is neceſſary to ſaluation, ſeeing they can make vs wiſe vnto ſaluation by beleeuing in Ieſus Chriſt. For what do we ſeeke for more, then to be wiſe in ſuch manner, that we may be ſaued by beleeuing in that word which teacheth the faith in Ieſus Chriſt?

Saint *Iames* ſaith of the ſame word, that *it is able to ſaue our ſoules*, Iames 1. 21.

Saint *Paul* in the firſt to the Corinthians, cap. 4. 6. bounding or limiting the power of Paſtors and their authority in the Church, ſaith, *Let no man preſume aboue that which is written.*

The ſame Apoſtle in the twentieth of the Acts verſ. 27. ſaith, *For I haue kept nothing backe, but haue ſhewed you all the counſell of God.* Then it followeth euidently, that the traditions of Popes and of the Church of Rome, added from age to age ſince Saint *Pauls* time, are none of the counſels of God.

In the fourth of Deuteronom. verſe 2. & in chap. 12. 31. God ſaith, *You ſhall not adde vnto the word which I command you, neither ſhall you diminiſh ought from it.* Then, if it was forbidden to the Iewes to adde any thing to *Moſes* law, when there was

no

no other doctrine to ſaluation but that, there is no apparence that now at this day, the law of *Moſes*, the Prophets, the Euangeliſts, & the writings of the Apoſtles, are not ſufficient, & that it is allowable to adde traditions and an vnwritten word thereunto.

None of our aduerſaries euer yet durſt denie, that the doctrine of the Goſpell is ſufficent to ſaluation, and that the Goſpell is not wholly & entirely ſet downe in the new Teſtament: otherwiſe, the title ſhould be falſe, and we muſt change the title, and write *part of the Goſpell*, and after ſeeke the other part in the vnwritten word. We muſt alſo change this word of *Teſtament*, which is ſet at the beginning, if that book be but a part of the Teſtament of the Sonne of God. And we muſt no more call thoſe bookes canonicall, if they be no more the entire rules of our faith.

The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* to the Epheſians, chap. 2. 20. groundeth our faith vpon the Prophets and Apoſtles: *And are buile* (ſaith he) *vpon the foundation of the Apoſtles and the Prophets.* If our faith be grounded vpon the vnwritten word, it muſt haue another ground then that of the Prophets and Apoſtles. For how ſhould we know that this vnwritten word comes from the Apoſtles? But it is eaſie for vs to note the originall, the Authors, and the times of the moſt part of the traditions of the Church of Rome.

In the ſixteenth of S. Luke, verſe. 19. the wicked rich man prayeth *Abraham* to ſend one from the dead vnto his brethren, to warne them of their duties, leſt they ſhould fall into the like torment: to whom *Abraham* anſwered and ſaid, *They haue Moſes and the Prophets, let them heare them.* Which euidently ſhewed, that they ought to content themſelues with *Moſes* & the Prophets, which the Church had in their hands, without expecting other reuelation.

In Eſay cap. 8. 20. God reproouing his people, becauſe they ſought to familiar ſpirits & vnto wiſards, he ſends thē to the word contained in his Law: *To the Law, and to the teſtimony; if they ſpeake not according to this Word, it is becauſe there is no light in them.*

In

In the Gal.cha.1.8.it is ſaid, *But though we or an Angell from heauen preach vnto you otherwiſe then that which we haue preached vnto you, let him be accurſed.* Note that he ſaith *otherwiſe*, & not againſt *that which we haue preached vnto you.* Althought it is to be vnderſtood, that all doctrine in matter of ſaluation that is without, is alſo contrarie to the Scripture, ſeeing it is contrary to the prohibition to adde to the word of God, and that God forbids vs *to teach mens precepts for doctrine*, Matth.15.9. A little before that, the Lord had condemned the Phariſes, becauſe they trangreſſed the commandements of God by their traditions.

Whoſe traditions if they be conſidered, you ſhall find, that they were doctrines that commanded not things to be done that were expreſſely prohibited in the Law of God, but ſimply additions, and voluntarie deuotions out of the word of God; as to make cleane the outſide of the platter, to waſh their hands before they did eate with ſcrupulous deuotion; to tythe Mint and Cũmin, to weare long garments, to faſt three times a weeke, to make long prayers: to make conſcience to heale a ſicke man vpon the Sabbath day. Such alſo were the traditions touching the diſtinctions of holy dayes, and abſtinence from certaine kinds of meates, which ſaid, *Eate not, taſte not, touch not*, Coloſ.2.16, 21. not vpon an opinion, that thoſe meates were vncleane, but *by voluntarie deuotion and humilitie of ſpirit, to tame the fleſh, and not to care for the ſatisfying of the fleſh*, as the Apoſtle ſaith in the ſame place. Of all which traditions the Apoſtle in the ſame chapter, verſe 8. ſaith, that it is *a vaine deceit, through the traditions of men.*

Greg. Naz. in Epicedio Athanaſij. ἡγεῖσθαι τὰ ἄγραφα παραδόσεις.

This onely thing (the vnwritten word,) which *Gregorie Nazianzen* calleth an *inuention not written*, and oppoſeth it againſt *written pietie*, manifeſtly diſcouereth the abuſe. For ſome of the people may ſay, Where ſhall I find this vnwriten word? ſhall I find it in the mouth of my Vicar? What know I whether he erre? What know I whether he ſpeakes acording to the holy Scriptures, the reading whereof is forbidden vnto me? What know I whether he agree with others? ſeeing there

are

are diuers contrarie Churches, that haue contrarie traditions? or if this vnwritten word be found in the mouth of the vniuerſall Church, how ſhall I get the vniuerſall Church together to heare it ſpeake? If I muſt haue recourſe to the ancient Church, how ſhall I reade ſo many Fathers, both of Latine & Greek Councels, which my Vicar vnderſtands not, & wherein the wiſed men are many times much puzzled? And yet I heare diuers men ſay, that the Fathers and ancient Councels are contrarie to the Church of Rome; and that there is not any one in the primitiue Churches that ſpeaketh of the worſhipping of images, of forbidding the people the chalice, or the reading of the holy Scriptures: or of the adoration of the hoſt with Latria; of Romane Indulgences, of priuate Maſſes, of prayer that is not vnderſtood by him that prayeth; of reading the Scripture to the people in a tongue which they vnderſtand not; of the power of the Pope to giue and take away kingdomes at his pleaſures, and to draw ſoules out of Purgatorie.

In all theſe things the truth is ſo ſtrong, that M. *Arnoux* in his anſwer paſſeth ouer condemnation of this Article, and agreeth with vs that the holy Scripture is a ſufficient rule of ſaluation, *becauſe* (ſaith he) *it ſendeth vs to the Church, and to that which the Paſtors ſay.* Wherein he contradicteth himſelfe: for to ſend to another place to ſeeke for rules, is not a ſigne of a ſufficient rule. If the Scripture ſend to the Church to learne that which is not in the Scripture, by this ſending ſhe confeſſeth her imperfection. By the like reaſon I may ſay, that a man which cannot reade, giues ſufficient rules, to learne Philoſophie, when he ſendeth or directeth one to a good Philoſopher to be taught. I muſt adde hereunto, that when M. *Arnoux* ſaith, that the Scripture ſends vs to the Paſtors, it preſuppoſeth that it ſends vs to thoſe that are good and faithfull: then we muſt firſt know how to diſcerne them: but how ſhould we diſcerne them but by the rule propounded in the word of God? This doctor therefore manifeſtly mocketh thoſe that are his audience, when he ſends them to heare the Church and the Paſtors, without telling them how, or by

what

what meanes they ſhall diſcerne the good and orthodoxall Paſtors from the wicked & heretickes, and the pure Church from the impure and hereticall.

The truth will yet appeare more euidently, when we ſhall haue ſeene and examined vpon what paſſages of the Scripture our aduerſaries ground their traditions. Ieſus Chriſt (ſay they) in the 16. of Saint Iohn, verſe 12. ſaith, *I haue many things to ſay vnto you, but you cannot beare them now*: And thereupon they would make vs beleeue (without proofe) that thoſe things which the Lord had yet to ſay, are the Traditions of the Church of Rome, as the Inuocation of Saints, the diſtinction of meates, the obſeruation of feaſts, the ſingle life of Prieſts, the Popes ſucceſſion in Saint *Peters* chaire as head of the Church, the priuate Maſſes, the drawing of ſoules out of Purgatorie, &c. This is a bold diuination, & for his own profit. But there is no need to diuine, when Ieſus Chriſt expoundeth himſelfe: for in the verſe following he declareth what thoſe things were that he had yet to ſay, and which the holy Ghoſt ſhould declare vnto them: which is, that the ſame Spirit ſhould tell them *things to come*: which are thoſe propheſies, which the Apoſtles afterward foreſhewed, viz. that there ſhould a ſonne of perdition come, that ſhould call himſelfe God, and ſhould worke wonders and miracles: that there ſhould falſe Doctors come, that ſhould teach men to abſtaine from marriage and from meates: that there ſhould one come that ſhould be clothed in ſcarlet, that ſhould ſeduce Kings, and ſhould haue his ſeate in the Citie that ſtandeth vpon ſeuen hilles.

They obiect alſo, that Saint *Paul* hauing in his firſt Epiſtle, and the 11. chapter to the Corinthians, propounded and ſet downe the forme and inſtitution of the holy Supper, as he had receiued it from the Lord, in the 34. verſe addeth: *Other things will I ſet in order when I come.* I anſwer, that it cannot without impietie be denied, that Ieſus did inſtitute the holy Supper as it ought to be, without omitting any thing of that which was neceſſarie: whereupon it followeth neceſſarily, that Saint *Paul* reſerued vnto himſelfe at his comming, the exterior

exterior order, and that which concerneth the decencie of the action. It is also by no meanes to be beleeued, that Saint *Paul*, after he had set downe the institution of the holy Sacrament, had an intent to mend it, and to contradict that which he himselfe had ordained. The things then which he reserued for himselfe to ordaine, are not those things which the Church of Rome hath added to the Sacrament, whereby she ouerthroweth the Lords institution. For Iesus Christ did not lift vp the host, he commanded not the people to adore the sacrament: he offered nothing to God in sacrifice: and speaketh not of sacrificing: he gaue both kinds to all men: he spake in a tongue knowne to all: he asked not saluation of God for the merits of the Saints whose bones were hidden vnder the altar: he turned his face to the people, and not his backe. To be short, he did all things cleane contrarie to that which the priest at this day doth. And such contrary inuentions to the institution of Iesus Christ, they call Apostolicall traditions; therein vsing the Gibeonites subtiltie, who coming but a little way, fained to come from a farre country: for they couer the new inuentions with the godly cloake of antiquitie, & vnder colour of adding, they change and correct the institution of the Lord. M. *Arnoux* will presently bring vs a passage for Traditions out of the second to the Thessalonians, chap. 2. which we will examine in his place. Now he proceedeth to scrape at the margent of our Confession.

ARNOVX.

Places or passages quoted in the margent of the Confession. Iohn 15.11. *These things haue I spoken vnto you, that my ioy might remaine in you, and that your ioy might be fulfilled. Doth he say more or lesse, that we must beleeue nothing but that which is set downe in writing? doth he speake of any Scripture? To what purpose then is this text alledged, but for a shew, and tost and instead of proofes?* Acts 20.27. *For I haue kept nothing backe, but haue shewed you all the counsell of God. It is Saint Paul that speaketh. Is there one onely word herein, that bandieth as that which is controuersed in the Article? And if a Minister should say to his audience, I haue* 14. Sect.

preached

preached the will of God vnto you, do you thinke that he would say that you shall beleeue nothing but that which I haue written vnto you? so should we beleeue nothing but the Epistles of Saint Paul which speake in the place which is quoted.

MOVLIN.

If those two places were ill quoted, yet the article of our Confession would neuertheleſſe be firme, ſeeing it is proued by ſo many other paſſages wch M. *Arnoux* dares not meddle withall. One onely place of the Scripture is ſufficient to eſtabliſh a doctrine: which cannot be ouerthrowne, but by confuting all the prooſes whereupon it is grounded. So all that which M. *Arnoux* doth, ſerueth to eſtabliſh this Article of our Confeſſion, ſeeing, that ſaying nothing againſt the other places that are quoted, he approueth them by his ſilence.

Neuertheleſſe theſe two paſſages taken in the ſence and to the end for the which we alledge them, will be found to be fitly applyed. By them we beate at the traditions that adde any doctrine which is not contained in the holy Scriptures: whereof our aduerſaries themſelues do ſet downe vnto vs the authors, and tell vs, that ſuch and ſuch a Pope added this piece to the Maſſe: that ſuch and ſuch a Pope that lined ſo many yeeres ſince the Apoſtles times, made this order and decree, which was neuer practiſed before. Againſt that; we alledge the words of Ieſus Chriſt, *Theſe things haue I ſpoken vnto you, that my ioy might remaine in you, and that your ioy might be fulfilled.* And that which Saint *Paul* ſaith to the Epheſians in the 20. of the Acts, *For I haue kept nothing backe, but haue ſhewed you all the counſell of Chriſt.* For if theſe additions, and new traditions of Popes, long ſince added, are neceſſarie to ſaluation, it is impoſſible that the ioy of the Apoſtles and of their diſciples was accompliſhed: neither did the Apoſtles declare all the counſell of Chriſt. For that Saint *Paul*, by the Counſell of Chriſt, manifeſtly vnderſtandeth the Goſpel. verſe 21. Now it were impietie to ſay, that the new Teſtament containeth but a part of the Goſpell, for if that were ſo, the title ſhould be falſe, and we muſt put *a piece*, or *halfe of the Goſ-*

pell,

ſell, in the title. And to conclude, the Apoſtle in the very ſame place ſheweth wherein the counſell of Chriſt conſiſteth, to wit, in repentance towards God, and faith in Ieſus Chriſt: which are two points fully and amply taught in the hole Scriptures. By the way, I pray you note M. *Armux* eloquence, which ſpeaketh of bandying of paſſages, as if he playing at tennice.

ARNOVX.

Contrary paſſages, 2 Theſſalonians Chap. 2.15. Therefore brethren, ſtand faſt, and keepe the inſtructions (*or traditions,*) which ye haue been taught, either by word or by our Epiſtle. *Vpon which words in that place, Saint Iohn Chryſoſtome ſaith very well: By that it appeareth, that the Apoſtle did not teach all by his Epiſtles, neither ſet it downe in writing, but left diuers things by tradition, and will haue men to receiue and eſteeme them all to be worthy of like credit: and therefore wee ſticke to the traditions of the Church, and firmely beleeue them; and when wee are told that it is a tradition, we make no further enquiry nor queſtion thereof. I am content with this Text onely for my purpoſe, becauſe it plainely ſheweth vs, that wee muſt beleeue ſome thing that is not written.* 15 Sect.

MOVLIN.

The ordinary manner both of old and new heretickes, is, that when the holy Scripture faileth them, they haue recourſe to traditions. *Ioſephus* in the thirteenth booke of Antiquities and eighteenth chapter, ſaith, that *the Phariſes had many obſeruations by ſucceſſiue tradition from their fathers, which are not written in the law of Moſes.* *Tertulian* become an hereticke in his booke of Monogamie, chapter 2. defendeth *Montanus* hereſie, by theſe words of Ieſus Chriſt: *I haue yet many things to ſay vnto you, but you cannot beare them now.* Which is the place that *Bellarmine* produceth for traditions, in the fift chapter of the booke of the vnwritten word, cutting this paſſage according to his manner. For in the verſe following, Ieſus Chriſt declareth what thoſe things were which they could

Νόμμα πόλλα παρέδωκαν οἱ φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς ἃ μὴ ἐν γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μώσεως νόμοις.

could not yet beare, that is, *things to come*, as the prophesies touching future euents, which are found in the Epistles of the Apostles, and in the Reuelation; and not any other doctrines of faith. *Irenæus*, in the second chapter of his third booke saith, that *when men confuted heretikes by the Scripture, they beganne to accuse the Scriptures, saying, That the truth could not be found in the Scriptures by them that knew not the tradition, because it had not beene giuen by writing, but by word of mouth.* About twenty yeeres after the death of Saint *Iohn*, one of his Disciples named *Papias*, Bishop of Hierapolis, began to hearken to vnwritten traditions, which were *Parables and strange Doctrines, and other fabulous things*; as *Eusebius* writeth in the last chapter of the third booke of his History.

Quia non posset ex his inuenri veritas ab his qui nesciant traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per viuam vocem.

Ξένας τινὰς παραβολὰς τῶν τυπῶν καὶ διδασκαλίας ἀλλοτρίας καὶ μυθώδεις.

These heretickes wanted not successours: the most fertile Church for traditions hath beene the Church of Rome, for that of a Bishop, not worth sixe pence in substance, to make an earthly Monarch that exceedeth Emperors and Kings in worldly-wealth, honor and riches, it was necessary to make great additions, and to patch long pieces to the ancient doctrine. And it is manifest in histories to be seene, that as the Bishop of Romes greatnesse increased, traditions were multiplied, which are much more recommended by our Aduersaries than the holy Scriptures, & more religiously obserued. For in Rome, adultery is permitted, but flesh is strictly forbidden to be eaten in Lent. The reading of the Bible prohibited, and Images erected in the Churches. Bishops dispence with the Apostles commandement, that will haue them not to be nouices, but fit to teach and instruct the people; for the most part of them preach not, and many Bishoprickes are giuen to children. But touching Annates and reuenues belonging to the Papall Seate, those are inuiolably obserued. *Bellarmine* dares presume, and proceedes so farre, as to say; *that some traditions are greater touching the obseruation thereof, then some Scriptures*, chapter 7. of the booke of the vnwritten word.

Now we haue oftentimes desired to see a list of those traditions,

tions; and of that vnwritten word reduced into one body, but our Aduerſaries would neuer giue vs the catalogue ther-of. Two things hinder them from it: The one is, that they know that whatſoeuer they do, yet a wauering doctrine will hardly be firmely imprinted in the minds and ſpirits of men, if it be not ſupported by Gods authority, ſpeaking by the Prophets and Apoſtles. The other; that if they ſhould deliuer a liſt of thoſe traditions to the common people, they would be abaſhed at their great number, and deſire to compare them with the Scriptures, wherein they ſhould find great contrariety with diuers traditions: in ſuch manner, that thoſe traditions would rather be found to be corrections, vnder pretence of tradition. And which is more, there they ſhould find traditions to be forbidden, Math. 15. 3. *Why doe you alſo tranſgreſſe the Commandement of God by your tradition?* And Coloſſians 2. 8. *Beware leſt there be any man that ſpoyle you through philoſophie and vaine deceit, through the traditions of men.*

The abuſe being therein ſo palpable, neuertheleſſe, M. *Irenæus* goeth about to ground traditions vpon the holy Scripture, therein contradicting the Church of Rome, which on the contrary will haue the authority of the Scripture to bee grounded vpon tradition. Whereby it followeth, that the authority of tradition cannot be grounded vpon the Scripture. To proue it, he alledgeth the 15. verſ. of the ſecond chapter of the ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians; *Therefore brethren, ſtand faſt, and keepe the inſtructions* (or traditions) *which you haue beene taught, either by word, or by our Epiſtle.* From this place our Aduerſaries inferre, that beſide the Epiſtle which Saint *Paul* wrote to the Theſſalonians, hee had told them many things by word of mouth; which we willingly grant: for, wee take not vpon vs to maintaine, that the firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians containeth all the Doctrine to ſaluation. Our difference is not, whether a ſhort Epiſtle written by Saint *Paul*, but whether the old and the new Teſtaments doe containe all that which is neceſſary to ſaluation? And which is more, if Saint *Paul* had ſaid, *Stand faſt, and keepe the inſtructions which you haue beene taught, either by our word, or by*

the holy Scripture: yet it ſhould not follow, that the things which he had ſaid vnto them by word of mouth, and thoſe that are written, were contrary things. A man may teach one ſelfe-ſame doctrine diuers wayes.

Our Ieſuite did well perceiue that this place was too weak for his purpoſe, and therefore he vnderpropt it with a place in *Chryſoſtome*, which he alledgeth otherwiſe than *Chryſoſtome* himſelfe doth, wherein theſe words, *ſet downe in writing*, *Tradition*, or *the Apoſtle*, are not to be found. And all that which hee ſetteth downe to be in the ſingular number, in *Chryſoſtome* is in the plurall number; yet I am content to receiue and allow of this place to be truly alledged.

Cyprianus epiſt. ad Pompeium, Vnde ſit ea traditio? vtrumne de Dominica & Euangelica auctoritate? See Auguſtine in the 5. booke of Baptiſme againſt the Donatiſts. cap. 26.

I ſay then, that when the Fathers ſpeake reuerently of traditions, by the word *Tradition*, either they vnderſtand the holy Scripture, which alſo is a tradition, that is, a doctrine left vnto vs: or by traditions, they vnderſtand obſeruations touching Eccleſiaſticall policy, and things which of their owne nature are not neceſſary; and which, for the greater part of them, are not now obſerued by the church of Rome. Reade chap. 2. and 3. of *Tertulian* of the Souldiers Crowne; and Saint *Auguſtine* in the hundred and eighteene Epiſtle, and the twenty ſeuen chapter of the booke of the holy Ghoſt, aſcribed to *Baſil*. Therein mention is made of diuers vnwritten traditions; and among others of being plunged three times one after the other into the water of Baptiſme: To taſte milke and hony at Baptiſme in ſigne of concord: Not to waſh our ſelues that day, nor all the weeke after: In euery action to make the ſigne of the Croſſe vpon the forehead: To make conſcience to faſt on the Sunday: To pray ſtanding from Eaſter to Pentecoſt: On certaine daies in the yeere to celebrate the paſſion, the reſurrection, and the Aſcenſion of the Lord: To pray towards the Eaſt: The anoynting with oyle, and diuers ſuch like traditions, whereof the moſt part are abroliſhed, which wrongfully were termed Apoſtollicall, ſeeing that the Apoſtles neuer practiſed them, ſpecially the cuſtome to pray ſtanding from Eaſter to Pentecoſt. For in Acts 20. 36. and 21. 5. Saint *Paul* prayed kneeling not many dayes before

before Pentecoſt, Acts 20.16.

M. Arnoux could not haue beene ignorant herein, and had not alledged *Chryſoſtome* contrary to his meaning, if hee had read the place it ſelfe in *Chryſoſtome* in ſtead of coppying the ſame out of another. For he might haue ſeene, that vpon the ſame ſecond chapter of the ſecond to the Theſſalonians, that Father hath theſe excellent words: *All thoſe things that are in the holy Scriptures are right and cleare: all that which is neceſſary, is therein cleare and manifeſt.* Then it followeth, that the traditions that are not in the Scripture, whereof he ſpeaketh, are vnneceſſary things. And vpon the Pſalme 95. * *When wee ſay any thing without the Scripture, the auditories thoughts are vncertaine.* Our aduerſaries obiect, that wee receiue many vnwritten traditions, as the obſeruation of the Sabbath day, baptiſme of little children, and the perpetuall virginity of the bleſſed Virgin *Marie*. I anſwer, that the obſeruation of the Sabbath day is found in the Acts, 20.7. and in the firſt of Corinthians, 16.2. and that the word, Sunday or the Lords day, is found in Apoc.1.10. And although it were not ſo, yet the perpetuall virginity of the bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, we beleeue, more for decencie then for neceſſity. As Saint *Baſil* taught in his Sermon of the holy Natiuity of Chriſt, where ſpeaking of their opinion that hold the contrary, hee ſaith, that it is a thing which by no means preiudiceth the word of piety. Touching the baptiſme of little children, the Index of the Bible made by the Doctors of Louaine, and *Bellarmine* in the firſt booke of Baptiſme, cap. 8. and diuers others, proue it by many places of the Scripture.

πάντα σαφῆ καὶ ἐυδιάτα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς, πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα

* ἐαν τι ἄγραφον λέγωμεν, ἡ διάνοια τῆς ἀκροατῆς σκάζει.

χώρειον παρέχει — τὰ δὲ νομιζόμενα τῷ μὲν ἔργα μὴ διαφθοροποιεῖν μαείας, ἡμεῖς δὲ εἰ καὶ μηδὲν τῆς τῆς εὐσεβείας παρημαίνεται λόγῳ, &c.

The iudgement of the ancient Fathers touching the perfection of the holy Scriptures.

ARNOVX.

Sant Aguſtine in the ſecond booke of Baptiſme againſt the Donatiſts, c. 7. ſaith, Many things are not found in the writings of the Apoſtles, nor in thoſe that followed them, neither in the Councels; 16. Sect.

and yet becauſe ſuch things haue beene obſerued, and holden by the Church, we beleeue that they come from them, and are taught and commanded by them.

And note, that in the ſame place he proueth by this rule of tradition, that we ought not to rebaptize thoſe that haue been baptized by hereticks, which is an article of the faith, and no Eccleſiaſticall practice.

MOVLIN.

This place is very ill tranſlated; theſe words of S. *Auguſtine*, *Neque in concilijs poſteriorum*, are tranſlated by our Ieſuite, *Of thoſe that followed them, nor in the Councels.* Wherein there is neither ſence nor reaſon: and he turnes *commendata* into *commanded.* All this proceeds not from want of vnderſtanding in the Latine tongue, but from truſting to another mans report. To vnderſtand this place of Saint *Auguſtine*, you muſt know, that he diſputeth againſt the Donatiſts, and maintaineth that we muſt not rebaptize thoſe that haue been baptized by hereticks: which cuſtome he ſaith is not written in the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles; and yet in the ſame worke he defendeth it, [a] by many places in the Scriptures, which he ſaith are moſt certaine. Whereby it appeareth, that in this place, by *the things not written*, he vnderſtandeth thoſe things that are not in expreſſe termes in the Scripture, but are gathered by good conſequence. As alſo that Saint *Auguſtine* placeth not this matter among the neceſſary points of ſaluation. For there he ſaith, [b] That this queſtion was not yet well handled, or ſoundly cleared in Saint *Cyprians* time. Now is it credible, that S[t] *Cyprian* was wanting in ſomething neceſſary to ſaluation?

To ſay that Saint *Auguſtine* beleeued, that the holy Scriptures contained not all that which is neceſſary to ſaluation, is a plaine confeſſion that hee neuer ſtudied that Doctors workes.

In his Epiſtle 142. cap. 9. [c] he ſaith, *By the Scriptures onely thou maiſt fully and plainely know the will of God.*

In the ſecond booke, of the merits of ſinnes, and of pardon,

Quam conſuetudinem credo ex Apoſtolica traditione venientem, ſicut multam inueniuntur in literis eorum, neque in concilijs poſteriorum, & tamen quia per vniuerſam cuſtodiuntur Eccleſiam, non niſi ab ipſis tradita & commendata creduntur.

[a] *Lib. 1. cap. 7. Ne videar humanis argumentis agere ex Euangelio, profero certa documenta.*

[b] *Nondum erat diligenter illa baptiſmi quæſtio pertractata.*

[c] *Per ſolas Scripturas potes plenam Dei intelligere voluntatem.*

pardon, cap. 36. he ſaith, [d] *when wee diſpute of a thing that is very obſcure, without the aide of the cleare and certaine inſtructions of the diuine Scriptures, mans preſumption muſt be limited.*

And he himſelfe againſt *Petilians* letters, lib. 3. cap. 6. ſaith, [e] *Reade this vnto vs from the Law, the Prophets, the Pſalmes, the Goſpell, and the writings of the Apoſtles, and we will beleeue it.*

In the ſecond booke of Chriſtian Doctrine, cap. 6. it is ſaid, [f] *In thoſe things that are plainely ſet downe in the Scriptures, all things that containe faith and good manners, are contained.*

The reſt of the Fathers ſpeake not otherwiſe. [g] Saint *Athanaſius* in the beginning of the prayer againſt the Gentiles ſaith, *The holy Scriptures diuinely inſpired, are ſufficient to make men vnderſtand the truth.*

S. *Hierome* vpon the firſt chapter of the [h] Prophet *Aggee*, ſaith, *Thoſe things which men inuent of themſelues, as it were by Apoſtolicall tradition, without the authority and witneſſe of the holy Scriptures, are confounded by God.*

S. *Baſil* ſpeaketh excellently vpon that place, about the end of his Ethickes or morall Philoſophie, which are among his Aſcetiques *If* (ſaith he) *all that which is not of faith, is ſinne, as the Apoſtle ſaith, and that faith commeth by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God,* [i] *all that which is without the Scripture, diuinely inſpired, not being of faith, is ſinne.*

If in things neceſſary to ſaluation, theſe Doctors reiected all traditions not contained in the holy Scripture, by greater reaſon, after ſo many ages and continuance of time, there is leſſe apparence to make new additions. For when will they ceaſe from adding? *Bellarmine* in the third chapter againſt [k] *Barkley*, ſeeing that the Popes power to diſpoſe kings, is deſtitute of all ancient teſtimony, ſaith, That *the Church in theſe latter times, hath yet power to conſtitute and ordaine things that concerne faith and good manners.* Where-

[d] *Vbi de re obſcuriſſima diſputatur, non adiuuantibus diuinarum Scripturarum certis clariſq; documentis, cohibere ſe debet humana præſumptio.*

[e] *Legite hæc nobis de lege, de Prophetis, &c. & credemus.*

[f] *In his quæ apertè poſita ſunt in Scriptura, inueniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moreſq; viuendi.*

[g] αὐτάρκεις εἰσὶν αἱ θεῖαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν

[g] *Sed & alia quæ abſq; authoritate & teſtimonijs Scripturarum quaſi traditione Apoſtolica ſponte reperiunt atq; confingunt, percutit*

gladium Dei. [i] πᾶν τὸ ἐκτὸς τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς ἐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἐστιν, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. Edit. Baſil. pa. 437.

[k] *Non reſte de Eccleſia Chriſti ſentit, qui nihil admittit niſi quod expreſſè in veteri Eccleſia ſcriptum, aut factum eſſe legit. Quaſi Eccleſia poſterioris temporis, aut deſierit eſſe Eccleſia, aut facultatem non habeat explicandi & declarandi, conſtituendi etiam & iubendi quæ ad fidem & mores Chriſtianos pertinent.*

upon it followeth, that the religion of the Romiſh Church is not yet perfected, ſeeing that yet men may adde precepts touching faith and good manners thereunto. And the Bull *Exurge*, which is at the end of the laſt Councell of Latran, placeth this among *Luthers* hereſies, that he ſaid, *That it is not in the power of the Pope and the Church of Rome, to eſtabliſh articles of the faith.*

ARNOVX.

17. *Sect.* *The ſame article lower. All things ought to be examined, ruled, and reformed, by, and according to the Word of God.*

True, according to the Word of God, but how to be vnderſtood? Note that they pretend, that the ſence by them giuen to the Word of God, is the touchſtone of all the truthes of our beleefe. For otherwiſe, it is not to be doubted, that the Word of God ſtrengthened by the ſence which the Church giueth thereunto, is the law, which neither can nor ought to be conteſted with all.

MOVLIN.

It is falſe, that we pretend that the ſence which we giue to the Word of God, ſhould bee the touchſtone of all truthes. None of vs calleth himſelfe an infallible interpreter. Wee receiue no other interpretation of the word of God, then that which is drawne out of the Word of God. So they are not found by vs, but by the word of God, which is infallible. And in ſuch things as are clearely ſet downe in the Scripture, and that haue no neede of interpretation, all doctrines neceſſary to ſaluation are contained. By this meanes there is no need of an interpreter, in that ſence whereby an interpreter at this day is vnderſtood, that is, of ſuch a one as giues his interpretations for lawes: ſuch as the Pope and his Prelates ſay they are. Of which impiety, and how thereby guiltie perſons make themſelues Iudges of the law, and ſeruants Interpreters of their Maſters commandements, and how they alwaies interpret the Scriptures for their profit, and to ſerue for gaine, and what horrible and extrauagant interpretations they make of the Scriptures, it hath bin formerly handled at large in the ninth Section.

ARNOVX.

ARNOVX.

Paſſages quoted in the margent of the confeſſion. 1 *Cor.*11.1,2. *Bee yee followers of mee, euen as I am of Chriſt. Now brethren, I commend you that you remember all my things, and keepe the ordinances as I deliuered them vnto you. And in the* 23. *verſe, For I haue receiued of the Lord that which I alſo haue ſaid vnto you. Doe theſe two paſſages conclude the article for the which they are ſet downe as a proofe?* 18. Sect.

MOVLIN.

Theſe two paſſages are wholy and altogether formall, to proue that all things ought to be ruled and reformed by the holy Scripture. For here the Apoſtle, to reforme the abuſe which the Corinthians committed in the celebration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, draweth them to the inſtitution of the holy Supper, as it is written in the Goſpell. It importeth not, whether all the foure Euangeliſts, or one part onely were then written: for alwaies this is certaine, that he reformeth the Corinthians by the rule cõtained in the Scriptures which we at this day haue.

By the way you muſt note, that *M. Arnoux* falſifieth the words of Saint *Paul*, and putteth *I haue receiued of the Lord that which I haue ſaid vnto you*, in ſtead of *that which I haue deliuered vnto you*: becauſe theſe words ὁ παρέδωκα, *quod tradidi vobis*, ſhew that Saint *Paul* calleth a doctrine contained in the Scriptures, a tradition. M. Arnoux falſification.

Of the authoritie of the Church, and whether ſhee bee the Iudge of the Scriptures, and whether M. Arnoux hath reaſon to call the Scriptures a dumbe rule.

ARNOVX.

*Contrary paſſages. Math.*23.2, *and* 3. *The Scribes and Phariſes are ſet in Moſes ſeat, all therefore whatſoeuer they bid you obſerue, that obſerue and do, but after their works do not: and Mathew* 18.17. *Tell it vnto the Church, and if he refuſe to heare the Church, let him be as an heathen man or a Publican. And in Deu-* 19. Sect.

teronomie,

In the 11. verſe.

teronomie, 17.8. *Thou ſhalt doe all that that they ſhall tell thee, which preſide in the place which the Lord hath choſen, and which they ſhall teach according to the Law, and thou ſhalt follow their ſentence, without declining to the right hand or to the left. But hee that by preſumption will not obey the commandement of the Prieſt, which ſhall for that time, be the Miniſter of thy God, and hath the ſentence of a Iudge, that man ſhall die.*

Now you muſt note (by the ſecond of Paralipomenon, chapter 19. verſe 10. that iudgement and examination belongeth to the Prieſt, in all the foure chiefe controuerſies, that is, when there was any queſtion of the law of the ten Commandements, of morall commandements not ſet downe in the Law, of ceremoniall precepts for diuine worſhip, and of Iudiciall precepts for peace and iuſtice. Behold then, both the one and the other law (the iudgement of truths,) put into the hands of the Church eſtabliſhed by God, and not left to the mercy of their opinions which would abuſe a dumbe rule, caſting off the yoke of the interpreters that are ordained by God.

MOVLIN.

By the paſſage of the three and twentieth of Saint Mathew, *M. Arnoux* ſetteth the Paſtors of the church of Rome in the Phariſes place, and vnderſtandeth, that although they ſay, and do not, & that their liues are contrary to their doctrines, yet men muſt obey them in all things, and doe all that they command, becauſe they haue the chaire and the ordinary ſucceſſion. I anſwer, that in that wherein he condemneth the actions of the Paſtors of the Romiſh church, and compareth them to the Phariſes, I will not contradict him. But whereas he thinks it fit for vs to beleeue the Phariſes in all things, and to doe all that which they ſay, without any exception, he contradicteth Ieſus Chriſt, which reproched them, *that they tranſgreſſed the commandement of God by their tradition: and that they taught doctrines that are the precepts of men*, Mathew, 15.3,9. Therefore Ieſus Chriſt, Math. 17.11. hauing commanded his Diſciples, *to beware of the leauen of the Phariſes*, Saint *Mathew* declareth that they vnderſtood, that Chriſt would haue them to beware of the doctrine of the Phariſes.

There-

Therefore he would not haue them obeyed in all things. And is not that iudgement a manifeſt impiety and a diuelliſh doctrine, which they pronounced with one accord, in the ninth chapter of Saint Iohn, that *whoſoeuer confeſſed Ieſus Chriſt, ſhould bee caſt out of the Synagogue*, that is, excommunicated? Was that a good doctrine, whereby *Caiphas* the high Prieſt and his adherents, pronounced Ieſus Chriſt to bee a blaſphemer, and worthy of death? *Bellarmine* himſelfe acknowledgeth, that the Lord in the fift of Saint Mathew confuted the peruerſe opinions of the Phariſes, that taught, that inward or ſecret cogitations were no ſinne. When Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, *Do all that they ſhall ſay vnto you*; hee meaneth things conformable to the Law. And as *Chryſoſtome* in his ſeuentie two Homily vpon Saint *Mathew* (where he expoundeth this paſſage) ſaith, *All thoſe things that correct and amend manners.* And ſo the Ieſuite *Maldonat* vnderſtandeth the 23. of Saint Mathew. *M. Arnoux* addeth a place out of the ſeuenteenth of Deuteronomie, and the eleuenth verſe, which confirmeth that. For there God ſaith, *Thou ſhalt do all that they ſhall teach according to the Law.* Ieſus Chriſt meaneth not, that they ſhould bee obeyed when they teach any thing againſt the Law. For the rule of the fourth of the Acts is without exception, *That wee muſt not rather obey men then God.*

Lib. 5. de amiſſ. gratia & ſtatu peccati, cap. 10.

πάντα διορθοῦντα ἤθους καὶ βίου τρόπον.

The ſecond paſſage alledged by *M. Arnoux*, is the eighteenth of Saint Mathew, where Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, *Tell it vnto the Church, and if hee refuſe to heare the Church, let him bee vnto thee as a heathen man or a Publican.* From whence hee inferreth, that in matters of doubt touching faith, we muſt go to the catholicke Romiſh Church, which is an infallible Iudge.

I anſwer, that our Aduerſaries alledging this place, corrupt it three wayes; firſt, they ſay, that by this place Ieſus Chriſt eſtabliſheth the Church to bee Iudge of the controuerſies in Religion, and of the points of faith. But there our Lord ſpeaketh not of points of faith, nor of doubts in Religion, but of quarrels between two particular perſons, where-

of

of the one hath offended the other: Iesus Christ speaketh of the censure of manners, and not of Doctrine. *If* (saith he) *thy brother haue sinned against thee, &c.* To say, that if the Church haue authority to iudge of quarrels betweene two particular persons, by greater reason shee hath authority to iudge of points of faith, with authority and infallible certaintie; is to dispute with as good probability, as if I should say, that hee that can carry a burthen that weigheth an hundred weight, by greater reason may carry a burthen of a thousand weight. Secondly they will, that by the word *Church* wee must vnderstand the vniuersall Church: which is impossible; for, for to end a quarrell betweene two neighbours, wee assemble not the vniuersall Church: wee must goe to a particular Church, which all men confesse to bee subiect to erre, and namely, in that which is spoken of in this place, that is, in giuing admonitions, and vsing of censures; wherein faults are committed, either by passion or by ignorance. In the third place, they will that by the Church we must only vnderstand the Romane, which is a rash supposition, without any colour. For if two Christians haue a quarrell in Syria, or in Ethiopia, must they go to the Romane church to end their difference? And in doubts of faith, why should not the Syrian or the Greeke Churches as well bee Iudges, which are much ancienter then the Romane, and haue Saint *Peters* chaire, and from whom the church of Rome hath receiued Christian religion? And the words of Church, of Priest, of Bishop, of Deane, of Baptisme, of Eucharist, and of Christian, that are Greeke, proue that the religion came from them from whom those termes are borrowed.

Extra ad Iudicij.

Pope *Innocent* the third speaketh better, who in the chapter, *Nouit*, attributeth vnto himselfe the knowledge of the differences betweene *Philip Augustus* King of France, and *Iohn* King of England, because it is said in the Gospell, *Dic Ecclesiæ*, as if by the Church, wee must vnderstand the Pope himselfe. Which interpretation seemes good to *Bellarmine*, in the 2. booke of the authority of Councels, cap. 19. *The Pope* (saith he) *ought to tell it to the Church, that is, to himselfe.*

Pontifex debet dicere Ecclesiæ, id est, sibiipsi.

To

To theſe three ſo eminent corruptions of this paſſage, our Aduerſaries adde two apparent kindes of iniuſtice: The firſt, that this place being one of thoſe whereon they ground the authority of the Romiſh church, neuertheleſſe, the church of Rome will be the only Iudge of the ſence of this place. In a cauſe where ſhee is party, and where her greatneſſe and authority is to be decided, ſhee will be abſolute and infallible Iudge. By this meanes, ſhe will be ſure to giue ſentence with her ſelfe, and be well aſſured to winne her cauſe.

The other injuſtice is much worſe: for when a queſtion is made, to know the true orthodoxall Church, that men may follow it; the Romiſh church taketh all meanes poſſible from the people, of knowing whether her Paſtors teach the true doctrine, or not. For, to examine the doctrine of her Paſtors by the holy Scriptures, is a thing not permitted to the people. To learne the reſolutions of doubts by reading of the Greeke and Latine Fathers, (the length and multitude whereof is infinite) is a thing which the people vnderſtand not. If we muſt be ſaued by that meanes, all women, and all the plaine countrey and vnlearned people are damned. So that to know whether the Church wherein wee liue, be a Church well grounded in the faith, there reſteth no other meanes for the poore people, but to beleeue their Paſtors, who will be ſure not to condemne themſelues. Was there euer more horrible cruelty layde on mens conſciences? Is not this a way to make the people in a manner, deſperately to play at hazard for their ſaluation, by following cuſtome, and thruſting themſelues in amongſt a company of blinde fellowes, that follow and goe on, without knowing any thing?

The third paſſage alledged by Mr. *Arnoux*, out of the ſeuenteenth chap. of Dureronomy, maketh for vs. For it commandeth to obey the Prieſts that teach according to the Law. If they teach otherwiſe, God will not haue men to beleeue them. When Pope *Iohn* the three and twentieth taught, that there was neither Paradiſe nor Hell, as it is ſaid in the Councell of Conſtance: or when Pope *Honorius* maintained

tained the Monothelites hereſie, for the which hee was excommunicated by three vniuerſall Councels. Mr. *Arnoux* would not haue men to beleeue him in that.

Then he needed not to ſpeake of the foure principall points of controuerſie, whereof he ſaith, the examination belongeth to the Prieſt: wherein neuertheleſſe he wrongeth himſelfe, to name morall commandements beſides the Decalogue, or ten Commandements. The Doctors of the Romane church, (as well as wee,) draw all the morall inſtructions and documents of good life and conuerſation, from the Law of God. Let the Reader marke by the way, the impious words of the Ieſuite, when hee termeth the holy Scripture to be a dumbe rule, vnder pretence that it hath neither mouth nor throate. Our aduerſaries writings are farced with ſuch injuries againſt the Word of God. *Baile* the Ieſuite, whoſe mouth Mr. *Riuet* hath perpetually ſtopt, in the firſt treaty of his Catechiſme, ſaith, that *Without the authority of the Church, hee would beleeue Saint Matthew no more than Titus Liuius* a Pagan Author. *Bellarmine* compareth & equalizeth the teſtimony which the holy Scripture yeelds of it ſelfe to be diuine, to the teſtimony which the Alcoran of *Mahomet* giues of it ſelfe, to be deſcended from heauen. There alſo he ſaith, that the Scripture is but a piece of a rule. Doctor *Charron* in his third truth ſaith, that the Scripture is a two-handed ſword, and that by it men become Atheiſts. Thus one of them after another call the Scripture diuinely inſpired, *a dumbe rule*, as if it were a woodden rule; which hee durſt not ſay of the Kings proclamations publiſhed and ſet on the poſts, although the paper hath no voyce. And although the Word of God contained in the Scripture makes no ſound in the paper, yet it hath a ſound in the mouth of the Sonne of God, and of the Apoſtles, and when God publiſhed his Law in the middle of fire; which ought to haue the like force, as if God at this day ſpake from heauen.

Bellarm. li. de verbo Dei non ſcripto, cap. 4.

What? ſhall that commandement of God pronounced by his owne mouth, (Not to haue any other God but himſelfe, and not to fall downe before or worſhip any image) be eſteemed

med a dumbe rule, vnder pretence that it is written? Yet heerein it is cleane contrary to the images whereof *David* ſpeaketh, ſaying, that they haue mouthes and ſpeake not. For it may be ſaid of the Scriptures, that they haue no mouth, and yet they ſpeake, ſeeing that they ſpeake ſufficiently, when they tell vs how God hath ſpoken, and when they teach vs to ſpeake; as *Eſay* ſaith in the 28. chapter and 20. verſe, *If we ſpeake not according to this Word, it is becauſe there is no light in vs.* The holy Scripture ſpeaketh ſufficiently, when it teacheth vs how we muſt ſpeake. If it ſpeaketh not, it is ſufficient that it ruleth vs. Then it is great impiety to deny, that the Word of God is our Iudge, vnder pretence that the paper hath no ſound. For that is not to bereaue the paper of the quality of a Iudge, but God himſelfe the Authour of that Doctrine. Pſalme 115

They ſerue their turnes alſo with another reaſon, to bereaue the holy Scripture of the Title or office of a Iudge, by ſaying, that the Church is ancienter than the Scriptures. If this reaſon be good, Magiſtrates could not be Iudges of the people; for the people are ancienter than Magiſtrates: and the people ſhould not be ſubject to the Lawes, for they are ancienter than the Lawes. Although diuers things, contained in the holy Scriptures are foũd to be ancienter than the Church: as all that which therein is ſaid of the nature of God, of his properties, of his eternall counſels, and of the worke of the creation. For by the Scriptures we vnderſtand not the paper and the print, but the doctrines therein contained.

α μὲν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὄντων φύσιν ἢ μαρτύρια ἢ ὑποθέσεις ἢ αὐτὴ κτίσις ἐστὶ πρότερα.

* *Quærendi ſunt iudices. Ergo in terris de hac re nullum poteris reperiri iudicium, de cœlo quærendus eſt Iudex. Sed vt quid pulſamus cœlum, cum habeamus hic in Euangelijs tot ſtamentum in-quam.*

But notwithſtanding all theſe conſiderations, the ancient Fathers made no difficulty to acknowledge the Scriptures for Iudge. *Clemens Alexandrinus* in the ſeuenth booke of Tapiſtries ſaith, *In the ſeeking out, or the examination of things, wee make the Scripture our Iudge.* And * *Optatus Milevitanus* in the fift booke againſt *Parmenian*, ſaith, *Wee muſt ſeeke for Iudges. If they bee Chriſtians, they cannot bee allowed on neyther ſide, for affections hinder the truth. Wee muſt ſeeke a Iudge without. If hee be a Pagan, hee cannot vnderſtand the myſteries of Chriſtians. If hee be a Iew, hee is an enemy to Chriſtian*

Christian baptisme. If then wee cannot finde any iudgement in this cause heere on earth, wee must seeke for a Iudge in heauen. But what needs wee knocke at heauen gate, seeing wee haue one heere in the Gospell, that is, the Testament? Of which Gospell Iesus Christ himselfe saith, Iohn the 12. chapter and 48. vers. *He that refuseth mee, and receiueth not my Words, hath one that iudgeth him, the word that I haue spoken, it shall iudge him in the last day.* The Pope and his Prelates must passe by this iudgement, and shall be judged by the same word whereof they say themselues are Iudges, and infallible interpreters. Albeit Pope *Innocent* the third, in the Bull *Ad liberandum*, which is at the end of the Councell of Latran, speakes as though hee should be Iudge at the latter day, and signifieth vnto all those that would not goe on the voyage into the East, nor contribute any thing towards the same, that they should answer for it vnto him at the terrible day of Iudgement. Reade Saint *Augustine* vpon that, in the eighteenth booke of Grace and Free-will, * where he will haue the Apostle to be Iudge, and to that end alledgeth a place out of the Apostle. And in the three and thirtieth chapter of the second booke of Marriage, and of Concupiscence, before he would alledge a place out of the Apostle, hee vseth this preface: *Let the Apostle be Iudge with Christ, for Christ himselfe also speaketh by the Apostle.*

* *Sedeat inter nos iudex Apostolus Iohannes, &c. Iudicet cum Christo Apostolus, quid in Apostolo ipse loquitur Christus.*

Whether the Priests lips do infallibly keepe knowledge.

ARNOVX.

20. Sect. *The lips of the Priest keepe knowledge, and they shall seeke the law at his mouth, Malachi 2. 7. The law giuen is not a law, but in the mouth of the Priest.*

MOVLIN.

In the Hebrew it is, *The Priests lips should keepe knowledge*; which is not a propheſie, but a commandement. By

these

these words God doth not foreshew that the Priests should neuer turne from the true doctrine, but forbiddeth them to turne from it. As when God in the Law saith, *Thou shalt not kill*: he doth not foreshew that there shall be no more murther, but forbiddeth to doe it. To make Gods Commandements prophesies, is as absurd a thing, as if wee should make prophesies commandements: as if when Iesus Christ said, *One of you shall betray me*, the Apostles should haue taken that for a commandement to betray him. There is the like absurdity in this changing or altering of the Word of God, whereby this commandement giuen to the Priests to keepe knowledge, is taken for a prophesie that they shall alwayes keepe it, vpon it to ground the infallible knowledge of the Popes and the prelates of the Church of Rome. Heere are already two faults, one, in the falsification of the words, the other in the corruption of the sence; and now you shall see a third, that is a cutting away a piece of the passage, which M. *Arnoux* cuts cleane in the middle: for the lines following shew, that the same Priests to whom *Malachi* speaketh, had not kept knowledge, had seduced the people, and had corrupted the couenant of God. For presently after, *Malachi* saith, *But you are departed out of the way, you haue caused many to stumble at the Law, you haue corrupted the couenant of Leui*: but the Iesuite would not adde that. M. Arnoux falsification.

It was not enough in one place of two lines to haue committed three faults, as falsification of the words, corruption of the sence, and cutting off some part of the passage: but to fill vp the measure of iniquity, hee addeth blasphemy, saying, *That the Law is not a Rule, but only in the mouth of the Priest*. If that be so, to reade the holy Scriptures is not to read the rule of saluation: and the written Commandements are not the Law of God, but begin to be a Law when the Priest pronounceth the same, that men should take no regard vnto that which they read, but to that which the Priest saith: who by this reckning may say vnto God: When we pronoūce thy Law, we make it begin to be a Law, and thou art beholding vnto vs, that we giue authority to thy word contained in the

holy Scriptures: to the end that no man ſhould be ſo ſimple to beleeue that the words of the Prieſts and Biſhops of Rome haue any force, vnleſſe they be conformable to the holy Scriptures: for on the contrary, if we will beleeue M. *Arnoux*, this Scripture, and the doctrine therein contained, takes their authority from the Prieſts and Biſhops of Rome: which being granted, it is to be preſumed, that God in acknowledging the kindneſſe that hee hath receiued from them, hee will eaſily grant them liberty to clip the Law of God, and to patch thereto ſome peeces of their owne. As we ſee in our Ladies houres, the Commandements of God ſet downe in this manner: 1 *I am the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt not haue, nor worſhip any other God but mee.* 2 *Thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine.* 3 *Remember that thou keepe holy the Sabbath, and other holy dayes.* They haue taken away the ſecond Commandement, and in the fourth thruſt in the obſeruation of holy daies. From hence alſo it followeth, that as *the Law giuen by God, is not a rule onely but in the Prieſts mouth*, ſo, that which is in the Prieſts mouth, ceaſeth not to bee a law, although it be not found in the written word of God, which is that dumbe rule, and that peece of a rule. After that what more is to be done, but to take the Turban, or Turkiſh wreathe?

Printed at Paris by *Heureux Blaniſlain* in Saint Victors ſtreet at the ſigne of the three Moores an. 1611.

THE SIXTH ARTICLE:

Of the Confeſsion of Faith.

This holy Scripture teacheth vs, that in this onely and ſimple diuine eſſence which wee haue confeſſed, there are three perſons, the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghoſt; the Father, the firſt cauſe, beginning, and originall of all things; the Sonne, his word and eternal wiſdom; the holy Ghoſt, his vertue, power, & efficacy:

The

The Sonne eternally begotten of the Father; the holy Ghoſt eternally proceeding from them both. The three perſons not confuſed, but diſtinguiſhed; and yet not deuided, but of one eſſence, eternity, power, and equality. And in that we auouch the ſame that hath been determined by ancient Councels; and deteſt all ſects and hereſies, which haue beene reiected by holy Doctors, as Saint *Hilary*, S. *Athanaſius*, S. *Ambroſe*, and S. *Cyril*.

THE SEVENTH ARTICLE.

We beleeue, that God in three perſons working together by his power, wiſdome, and incomprehenſible goodneſſe, hath created all things, not onely heauen and earth, and all that which is contained therein, but alſo the inuiſible ſpirits, whereof ſome are fallen into vtter perdition, the reſt haue continued in obedience. That the firſt being corrupted and malicious, are enemies to all good, and by conſequence, of all the Church. The ſecond hauing beene preſerued by the grace of God, are miniſters to glorifie the Name of God, and to ſerue for the ſaluation of his Elect.

THE EIGHTH ARTICLE.

Wee beleeue that hee hath not onely created all things, but that hee gouerneth and conducteth them, diſpoſing and ordering all things that happen and are done in the world according to his will: not that he is the author of euill, or that the fault thereof can be im-

puted vnto him, seeing that his will is the soueraigne and infallible rule of all right and equity: but he hath admirable meanes to be serued in such manner by the diuels and the wicked, that he can turn the euill which they doe (and whereof they are culpable) into good. And so, confessing that nothing is done without the prouidence of God, in humility wee adore the secrets that are hidden from vs, without enquiring further thereof than becõmeth vs. But rather apply that vnto our vse which is shewed in the holy Scripture for our repose and safety. For that God to whom all things are subiected, watcheth ouer vs with a paternall care, so that not one haire shall fall from our heads without his will: and in the meane time holdeth the diuels and all our enemies bridled, in such maner that they can doe vs no harme without his leaue.

In the Treatise of the iust prouidence of God.

M. *Arnoux* passing ouer these three articles, by his silence declareth that he can say nothing to them. Neuertheless, in another place he hath been fencing against the doctrine contained in the eighth article: imposing vpon *Caluin* and vs, that we make God the author of sinne; whereunto wee haue made answer in a Treatise apart by it selfe. But because this matter is the field wherein our enemies display their banners, and fall into odious exclamations; and for that this doctrine is thorny, and where the way is slippery, and the inuectiues plausible, it is necessary to cleare the matter, to preuent the slanders, and to vntangle the spindle, which Satans malice hath much twirled.

of

of the prouidence of God, and how God conducteth the actions of the wicked, without being author of sinne, or participating with their vices.

Three maximes or generall rules serue for the ground of this matter. The first is, that all things are gouerned and conducted by the prouidence of God: as Saint *Paul* saith, Ephes. 1.11. *God worketh all things after the counsell of his owne will.* 21. Sect.

The second is, that God is soueraignly iust, and is not the author of sinne, neither inciteth men to doe euill, as it is said in the 45. Psalme, and 7. verse: *Thou louest righteousnesse, and hatest wickednesse, &c.*

The third is, that man is the cause of his owne destruction, and that hee sinneth by his owne will; as God saith by the Prophet *Hosea.* 13.9. *O Israel, thou hast destroyed thy selfe, but in me is thine helpe.* Euen as in the generation of creatures celestiall causes worke with the inferiours: and if any imperfection happen, as when a monster is ingendred, that imperfection is neuer imputed to the celestiall, but to the inferior causes, and to the euill or bad disposition of the matter. So in voluntary actions, although God moueth and sustaineth them, neuertheleſſe if any default happen, it ought to be imputed to the will of man, and not to God. Whosoeuer receiueth not these three maximes, defendeth the reprobate cause, casteth the cause of their destruction vpon God, and will teach God to be iust, or bind him to yeeld an accompt of his actions.

But the holy Scripture sometimes vseth phrases of speech, from whence prophane men take occasion to make God author of their sinne, as if God had thrust them into it, or as if necessity to sin had beene imposed vpon them by the will of God, which man cannot withstand. For example, the children of *Iaakob* by a wicked conspiracie sold their brother *Ioseph* to bee carried into Egypt: whereof behold what *Ioseph* saith, Genes. 45.7. *God sent me before you, to preserue you a posterity in the earth, and to saue your liues by a great deliuerance.*

Whereby it appeareth, that the ſelling of *Ioſeph* was done by Gods prouidence. And in the firſt of Sam. 2. 25. it is ſaid, *That the children of Eli hearkened not vnto the voyce of their father, becauſe the Lord would ſlay them.* And in the 25. Chapter of the firſt of Kings, 10. ver. *A wicked ſpirit came before the Lord, and offered to make the Prophets lie, to whom God ſaid, Thou ſhalt perſwade them, and prouaile alſo, goe forth and doe ſo.* In the ſecond of *Samuel*, Chapter 16. *Semei* curſeth *Dauid* with execrable ſpeeches: whereupon *Dauid* ſaid, *So let him curſe, becauſe the Lord hath ſaid vnto him, Curſe Dauid.* And in the 12. Chapter of the ſame booke, God intending to puniſh the murther and adultery committed by *Dauid*, ſaid, that he would raiſe vp euill againſt him in his owne houſe, (that is, the rebellion of his owne ſonne,) and that he would take his wiues before his eyes; and after addeth, *For thou didſt it ſecretly, but I will doe this thing before all Iſrael.* So God ſuffered the diuell to afflict *Iob*, and the Caldeans to rob him of all his goods: and all that hiſtory is recited, as being done by the prouidence of God; and therefore *Iob* ſaid, *God hath giuen, and God hath taken it, bleſſed be the name of the Lord.* *Ieremie* in his Lamentations 3. 37. ſpeaketh thus of the deſolation of the Iewes by the Babylonians: *Who is he that ſaith and it commeth to paſſe, when the Lord commandeth it not? Out of the mouth of the moſt higheſt, proceedeth not euill and good?* Saint *Peter* in Acts 4. 28. ſpeaking of the conſpiracy of the Iewes, of *Herod*, and of *Pontius Pilate*, againſt Ieſus Chriſt, ſaith, they gathered themſelues together to doe thoſe things which the hand and counſell of God had determined before to be done. Thereby ſhewing, that all the euils committed againſt Ieſus Chriſt, were not done without the counſell of God. The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* in the firſt to the Romanes, ſpeaking of prophane men and infidels, ſaith, that God gaue them vp to their hearts luſts, to vncleanneſſe, to vile affections, to a reprobate minde, to doe thoſe things that are not conuenient. And God declareth, Exodus 10. and Romans 9. That he hardened *Pharaohs* heart. Gods words to the Prophet *Eſay* in the 6. Chapter verſe 10. are fearefull, ſaying, *Make the heart of this people fat, and make their eares heauy,*

and

and ſhut their eyes, leſt they ſee with their eyes, and heare with their eares, and vnderſtand with their heart, and conuert and be healed. Words, which being wrung and wreſted by ſome prophane man, might giue him occaſion to make God the cauſe of his infidelity.

But leſt that any man on the one ſide ſhould abuſe theſe places of Scripture, to brand the inſtice of God, or to make him author of ſinne, or to excuſe Libertines and prophane perſons, as if God had conſtrained them to doe euill; and leſt that on the other ſide we ſhould derogate any thing from the prouidence of God, eſteeming that the wickednes which man committeth, happeneth without his prouidence, Diuines produce and ſet down certaine doctrines and diſtinctions, which are reduced into the ſixteen propoſitiõs hereafter following.

1 The holy Scripture ſpeaketh vnto vs of two ſorts or kinds of the will of God, the one, the Commandement of God, the other, the decree of his prouidence. The firſt is the rule of his righteouſneſſe which is manifeſted vnto vs; the ſecond is the decree of his ſecret counſell. The firſt ruleth and gouerneth our thoughts, words, and workes: the ſecond diſpoſeth and ordereth the euents of all things which happen and are done in the world. We are bound onely to obey the will of God, which is his Law, without inquiring or making queſtion of his ſecret decrees, and the determinations of his prouidence, Deut. 29. 29. The ſonne that prayeth vnto God for the health and recouery of his father that is ſicke, doth a worke acceptable vnto God, and according to his commandement, although this prayer be contrary to Gods decree, and to his counſell whereby he hath decreed that his father ſhall dye of that diſeaſe. The wicked are not excuſable, for that in the execution of euill they haue ſerued Gods ſecret decree, which the diuels alſo execute: for we ſhall not be iudged according to that whereby we haue ſerued God in his ſecret decree, but according to the meaſure whereby we haue obeyed Gods commandements.

2 To ſpeake properly, the decree of God onely, which is a determination of his prouidence, is the will of God. Tou-

ching his commandements, they are rather a rule of righteousnesse, and a declaration of that which God approueth, and which man is bound vnto, then a will decreed or determined.

3 When we say, that the decrees of the councell of God are hidden from vs, we must except those which God hath made manifest vnto vs by the execution and accomplishment thereof: and those that are declared vnto vs in the word of God, although they are not yet fulfilled: as the decrees of the councell of God, touching the destruction of Antichrist, and of the resurrection and the Iudgement to come.

4 There are two sorts of euill, the one is the euill of the fault, the other is the euill of punishment. The first euill proceedeth from man, the second commeth from God that punisheth the sinnes of men: neuertheless the euill of the fault sometimes serues for the euill of punishment, when God in his wrath withdraweth his grace and assistance from a man, because he abuseth it by ingratitude. And then that bridle and restraint being broken, men giue themselues ouer to vices which draw them into destruction: Then the euill of fault which serueth for a paine or punishment, proceedeth not from God, as it is the euill of fault, or as it is sinne, but onely God maketh it serue for a punishment.

5 God permitteth or suffereth sinne. For if God would hinder man from sinning, hee is powerfull enough to doe it: as Saint *Paul*, Rom. 9. 19. saith, *Who is he that can resist his will?* This permission is not forcible, but a voluntary permission: no man hath constrained him to suffer sinne to enter into the world. He hath then purposed to permit euill. Now God willeth nothing but that which is good: Therefore it was good that God permitted euill, for those reasons which he knoweth better thē we do. So then, that which we perceiue thereby is, that by that meanes God is much more glorified: for if there were no sinne in the World, wee should not know Gods iustice in punishing of sinne, nor his mercy in pardoning of sinne: and his infinite loue in the mystery of the incarnation of his Sonne had not been reuealed.

Nor

Not that God hath any neede of the sinnes of men to maintaine his glory and his beatitude: but I say, that God hauing determined to make man perfectly happy, by this permission of sinne, the way to leade a man to this perfection is opened. For if man had not knowne what sinne and wickednesse is, he could neuer haue attained to a perfect knowledge of the goodnesse and iustice of God. Now the finall end for which all things are made, is, that God might bee glorified: and with all, the Scripture teaching vs that God punisheth one sinne by others sinnes, if God onely permitted this punishment without willing it, that were not a punishment of a Iudge, who neuer punisheth by permitting the culpable to be punished, but by commanding. Looke, touching this punishing of one sinne by another sinne, in Saint *Augustine*, lib. 5. cap. 3. against *Iulian*.

6 There is none but God, that permitting euill can turne it into good: but men ought not to suffer or permit sin, nor to doe it, vpon hope that good may come thereof. The Pope that permitteth the stewes in Rome, to shun and preuent Sodomiticall sinne, as they say that seeke to excuse him, doth not remedy that euill; for Sodomiticall sinne ceaseth not to bee common there. Adde hereunto that the actions of God are not the rules of our life, but his Commandements.

7 The permission whereby God permitteth the wicked to sinne, is not a vaine or idle permission, but such as bridleth the wicked, to the end that they should not passe the limits of the prouidence of God, or to doe hurt vnto those whom God will blesse and preserue. For although the will of man be corrupted, yet God hath not lost his power, whereby he guideth all things, and keepeth mens wils in subiection, euen of those that resist his knowne will, which is his commandement.

8 There are two principall faculties in the soule of man, the vnderstanding and the will; the one, whereby man knoweth; the other, whereby he moueth: the one, whereby we are wise or ignorant; the other whereby we are good or euill:

euill: That which in the vnderſtanding is to affirme or deny, that in the will, is to deſire or ſhunne. God neuer puts euill deſires into the will of man, nor inciteth him to doe euill, but ſometimes in his wrath blindeth his vnderſtanding. For as a maſter doth wel to put out his ſchollers candle, when he ſeeth that he imployeth the night in lewdneſſe, or to reade wicked bookes: ſo God taketh away the light of his knowledge from thoſe that abuſe it by ingratitude. As Saint Iohn, 12.40 ſaith, *He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, &c.* Now as it may happen to that ſcholler being without light, to ſtumble and to hurt himſelfe, vnleſſe his maſter guide him: ſo after God hath blinded the vnderſtanding of any man, he falleth into vices, and addicteth his mind vnto euill, vnleſſe God guide him. So wee muſt vnderſtand that which God ſaith in the Pſal. 81.12. *I gaue them vp vnto their owne hearts luſts, and they walked in their counſels.* Looke Acts 14.16. and Rom. 1.25,26. It may alſo be ſaid, that God hardeneth the hearts of the wicked, in ſetting before them meanes proper and wholſome for ſaluation, as his Word and his Sacraments, and not giuing them grace & power to ſerue him as they ſhould, whereby it happeneth, that of themſelues they waxe worſe, God by that meanes puniſhing their peruerſity. This hardening of the heart, which followeth by accident of the blinding of the vnderſtanding, is the reaſon whereby the Scripture ſaith that God hardeneth the heart of the wicked. And yet to ſhew that the ground of this hardening proceedeth from man, the Scripture doth not onely ſay, that God hardened *Pharaohs* heart, but alſo that *Pharaoh* hardened or exaſperated his owne heart, Exod. 8.15. But there are two kindes of thoſe whom God hardneth, as alſo there are two kinds of hardening. For beſides that hardening which is common to all reprobates that haue abuſed the knowledge of God, there are ſome men wickeder then others, whom God deliuereth to Satan by a particular iudgement, and an extraordinary manner, as *Pharaoh*, *Saul*, and *Iudas*.

9 Euen as the Sunne is not the cauſe of darkneſſe, (for of his owne nature he produceth nothing but light) although

dark-

darkneſſe neceſſarily ſucceedeth when it is gone downe: So God is not the cauſe of ſinne, for of his nature he is righteouſneſſe it ſelfe, although irregularity, ſinne, and diſorder of affections neceſſarily enſue when hee hath withdrawne his grace. Some ſay, that the Sunne withdrawing it ſelfe, is the cauſe of darkneſſe, not the efficient, but the defectiue cauſe: But theſe termes are harſh, and ought not to be attributed vnto God: as alſo that by this diſtinction a thing that is no more, (as a light put out) might bee called a defectiue cauſe. Now that which is no more, can in no manner be a cauſe. But the abſence thereof may well be a cauſe of the truth of ſome affirmation.

10 Although the wicked worke voluntarily of themſelues, and without God being any cauſe of their ſinne, yee the euents that happen therby are directed by his prouidence. For, as the water of a ſpring, by nature is inclined to runne downeward, but by mans induſtry is drained, and by channels made to run where and which way he will: ſo the wicked are of themſelues inclined to euill, and God moueth them not to do euil, but directeth their wicked wils to execute one thing rather than another, by his ſecret iudgement to puniſh thoſe whom he will, and to exerciſe and try his children. The Wiſe man in the 21. of the Prouerbs vſeth this ſimilitude, ſaying: *The Kings heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the riuers of waters, he turneth it whither ſoeuer he will.*

11 God ſlacketh or looſeth the bridle to Satan and to the wicked, to execute their wicked intents, which proceed from themſelues and not from God: neuertheleſſe, all what ſoeuer they ſhall do, ſhall ſerue to effect the counſell of God: and as Saint *Peter* ſaith, *They ſhall do thoſe things which the hand and the counſell of God had determined before*, Acts 5.

Euen as horſeleaches applyed to a mans body, intend nothing but to fill themſelues with bloud; but the Phyſicians end who applyeth them, is to heale his patient: So the wicked, by whom God ſerueth his turne to chaſten his children, haue no other end, but to ſatisfie their inordinate luſts and deſires: but God making them his inſtrument, hath a re-

gard

gard to the ſalnation and inſtruction of his children. See *Eſay* 10.6,7. Neuertheleſſe God vſeth the ſeruice of the wicked, in ſuch manner that he conſtraineth not their wils, and taketh not from them their free choice, which in the wicked is moſt free to doe euill.

12 As God is neceſſarily good, and yet moſt free and without conſtraint; ſo the diuell and thoſe whom he gouerneth abſolutely, are neceſſarily euill, and yet doe euill without conſtraint, and with full libertie. Neceſſity is not oppoſite to libertie, but conſtraint. Neceſſity is ſo much the ſtronger, when it is voluntary. If man were driuen to do euill by a compulſiue neceſſity and not voluntary, God ſhould be vniuſt to punish him.

13 We muſt carefully diſtinguiſh the action from the deprauation or imperfection which is in the action. It is one thing to goe, and another thing to halt as we goe. The ſoule which moueth a lame man, maketh him goe, but maketh him not halt. That which is naturall, as going, comes from the ſoule: that which is vicious, is accidentall, and proceedeth from ſome other thing: ſo the action whereby a man ſinneth, is one thing, and the defect and deprauation in the action, another thing. There is great difference betweene the naturall mouing of the murtherer to kill, and the vice or repugnance to the Law of God which is in this action. That which is naturall in this action, proceedeth from God; *For by him we haue life, mouing, and being, &c.* Acts 17.28. And wee cannot ſtirre nor moue without his aide: that which therein is vicious, comes from man, and not from God.

14 We muſt carefully diſtinguiſh theſe three things, the will to ſinne, the execution of this will, and the euents which follow this execution. For example, in the ſelling of *Ioſeph*, the treaſon and the cruelty was in the hearts of his brethren, & came from them, and not from God. The execution thereof, which is the ſelling of *Ioſeph*, was alſo done by them, but directed by the prouidence of God. The euents that followed thereupon, as the exaltation of *Ioſeph*, and the preſeruation of the people of Iſrael, are purely and ſimply effects of the prouidence

uidence of God. Herein there is nothing ſo eaſie as to calumniate, by interpreting that which ſome of vs ſhall haue ſayd of the execution, or of the euents after the execution: as if his meaning were to ſpeake of the will to ſinne.

15 As in naturall workes or actions, God ſuſtaineth and moueth all creatures, not onely by a generall power, but alſo by his particular aſſiſtance: So we muſt ſay, that to moue mens wills to good, and to direct the wills of the wicked to the end and intent that God hath purpoſed, God ruleth and aſſiſteth, not onely by his generall ayde, but alſo by his particular prouidence: ſeeing it appeareth that the effects which follow, as the death of Ieſus Chriſt happened by the wickednesſe of the Iewes, and the preſeruation of the people of God by the ſelling of *Ioſeph*, are things manifeſtly guided by the ſpeciall prouidence of God.

16 When God looſeth the bridle to Satan to tempt man, well may the diuell ſolicite him, or preſent obiects vnto him to tempt him, or by ſome alteration of the humors of the body moue his fantaſie, but hee hath no power ouer the will of man, to conſtraine him to ſinne: otherwiſe, God ſhould be vnjuſt to puniſh man, and all the fault ſhould be in the Diuell.

Saint *Auguſtine* vſeth hard termes in this matter, which neuertheleſſe, by the diſtinctions aforeſaid may be mitigated. In the twentieth Chapter of Grace and Free-will, ſpeaking of *Semei*, curſing *Dauid*, vpon that which God had ſaid to *Semei*, Curſe *Dauid*: * *God* (ſaith hee) *did not command him to doe it, that his obedience might be prayſed, but becauſe God, by his iuſt iudgement, did incline his will to that ſinne, which was euill by his owne fault.* * And Chapter 21. *God worketh in the hearts of men, to incline their wills which way hee will, eyther to good by his mercy, or to euill according to their merits.*

And in the fifth booke againſt *Iulian*, the third Chapter, *The peruerſity of the heart commeth not without the ſecret iudgement of God, which maketh men not to hearken to the truth, and by that meanes they fall into ſinne: and ſo, that*

* *Non enim iubendo dixit vti obedientia laudaretur, ſed quod eius voluntatem proprio vitio malam, in hoc peccatum iuſto ſuo iudicio & occulto inclinauit.*

* *Operatur Deus in cordibus hominum ad inclinandas eorum voluntates quocunq; voluerit, ſiue ad bona pro ſua miſericordia, ſiue ad mala pro meritis eorum.*

ſinne is the puniſhment of precedent ſinne. And a little after, *Then God giueth them ouer to villanous deſires, to doe things that are not conuenient: but hee giueth them inſtly ouer, and ſo thoſe ſinnes become puniſhments for ſinnes paſt, and merits for future paines.*

Thomas Aquinas followed him, in his commentary vpon the ninth to the Romanes, the third Lecture: where after he hath ſaid, that God ſuffereth ſome to fall into ſinne, for puniſhment of precedent iniquities, he addeth: *I am of opinion, that in this place there is more to be vnderſtood: that is, that by a certaine interior inſtinct men are moued by God to good or euill. Therefore alſo Saint Auguſtine in his booke of Grace and Free-will ſaith, that God worketh in the hearts of men to incline their wills which way it pleaſeth him, whether it be to good according to his mercy, or to euill according to their merits.*

Bellarmine is intolerable in the thirteenth Chapter of the ſecond booke of falling from grace, and the ſtate of ſinne. *The ſecond meane* (ſaith he) *is, that wee vnderſtand that God moueth and prouoketh ſome men to euill, or that hee commaundeth them to doe euill, and that hee vſeth them as inſtruments, becauſe hee ſuffereth them to doe euill.* And in the 14. Chapter, *By the iudgement of God, puniſhing by precedent ſinnes, man is in ſuch ſort deſtitute of diuine ayd, that it is impoſſible for him not to fall.* After hee expoundeth from whence this neceſſity of falling commeth: that is (ſaith hee) becauſe *God doth not call him nor moue him ſo, as hee ſeeth him apt to follow God calling him,* that is, vouchſafeth him not congruent grace for him in this eſtate.

THE NINTH ARTICLE.

Of Free-will, and of naturall Corruption.

Wee beleeue that man hauing beene created pure, entire,

entire, and conformable vnto the Image of God, by his own fault fell from the grace that he had receiued, and ſo alienated himſelfe from God, who is the fountaine of all righteouſneſſe and of all goodneſſe, in ſuch manner that his nature is wholly corrupted; and being blinded in his ſpirit, and depraued in his heart, hath loſt all integrity, without any remainder thereof. And although hee hath ſome knowledge to diſcerne good and euill, notwithſtanding we ſay, that what light ſoeuer he hath, it is turned into darkneſſe, if the queſtion be of ſearching after God; inſomuch that by his vnderſtanding and reaſon, he can no way come neere him. And although that he hath a will, whereby he is moued to doe this or that, yet it is wholly captiuated vnder ſinne, in ſuch ſort, that he hath no liberty to doe good, but that which God giueth him.

ARNOVX.

It is one thing to ſay, that without the grace of God wee can doe no good, tending to life euerlaſting, and to the glory of Ieſus Chriſt, which is true; and another thing to ſay, that doing that good by the aide and motion of grace, we doe it as being conſtrained, preſſed, and drawne vnto it, without the vſe of our owne Free-will: which is the ſcope of this Artilce, ouerthrowing the Image of God in man, (that is, liberty) and ſupplanting the grounds and foundations of vertuous and commendable actions. 22. Sect.

MOVLIN.

To ſpeake in this manner, it is not to examine our Confeſſion, but to forge another to ſtriue againſt it, and ſo to make ſport. For wee beleeue nothing of all that which hee maketh vs to ſay, but deteſt the doctrine which hee attributeth vnto vs. For in our ninth Article there is not one word of

of all that which he maketh vs to say. We say not that wee doe good by constraint; we take not the liberty of mans will from him: wee know that the good which the children of God doe, they doe it voluntarily, and without constraint. This is our beleefe.

Man is considered two wayes, either such as hee is by nature, or such as hee is after hee is regenerated and led by the Spirit of God.

Touching man not regenerated, and such as hee is by nature, see what the Scripture teacheth vs, Genesis 6.5. God saith, that *Every imagination of the thoughts of mans heart, is onely euill continually*: and Gen. 8.21. *The imagination of mans heart is euill from his youth.* Saint *Paul* to the Romanes 5.12. saith, that *By one man sinne entred into the World, and death by sinne, and so death went over all men, inasmuch as all haue sinned.* And to the Ephesians, 2.1, 5. he saith, that *We are dead in trespasses and sinnes*, and that *God hath quickened vs.* Whereupon the Scripture calleth this changing into a better life, a second birt. Iohn 3.3. and a regeneration by the incorruptible seed of the Word of God, 1 Peter 1.23. and a Resurrection, Apocalyps 20.6. The Apostle S. *Paul*, Corinthians 2. chap. 3. vers. 5. saith, that *Wee are not sufficient of our selues to thinke any thing, as of our selues, but our sufficiency is of God.* Then if we be incapable of our selues to thinke any good thing, how much more to doe any good thing? The same Apostle in the 1 Corinthians, chap. 2. verse 14. saith, that *The naturall man perceiueth not the things that are of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishnesse vnto him.* And Romanes 8.7. *The wisedome of the flesh is enmity against God, for it is not subiect to the Law of God, neyther indeed can be.*

By these places and other such like, wee proue that which our Confession saith, that mans nature is altogether corrupt, and that man is blind in his spirit, and corrupt in his heart.

To the which proofes, we adde the places which say, that faith and the loue of God, and to be short, all vertues that are in vs pleasing to God, and all the good that we doe, commeth not from vs, but are gifts of God: as it is said in the Ephesians,

Ephesians 2.8,9. *For by grace yee are saued through faith, and that not of your selues, it is the gift of God: not of workes, lest any man should boast himselfe.* And Philip. 2.13. *It is God which worketh in you both the will and the deed, euen of his good pleasure.* So the Lord, Mathew 16.17. saith to Saint *Peter*: *Blessed art thou Simon the sonne of Ionas, for flesh and blood hath not reuealed it vnto thee, but my Father which is in heauen.* Therefore also in the 11.25. he gaue thanks to his Father, for that he had hidden those things from the wise and men of vnderstanding, and had opened them vnto babes. From the same spring proceedeth the loue that we beare to God, 1 Ioh chap. 4.20. *We loue God, because hee hath loued vs first.*

By all these proofes, wee intend not to take from the corrupt and vnregenerate man all freedome of will: we know well, that in naturall actions, which are ruled by the wil, as to eat, and to go; and in ciuill actions, to sell, contract, build, and trauell, man freely chuseth among many objects. Of this liberty in ciuill things, Saint *Paul* speaketh, 1 Corinth. 7. where hee saith, That the woman after the death of her husband is at liberty to marry againe, and putteth it to the choyce of the father to let his daughter marry, or to keepe her a virgin. Wee say more, that is, that man hath his free will in good and honest actions, belonging to ciuill honesty: as the actions of Pagans, which helpe vp a man that is fallen down, and set him in the way againe that hath lost his way. I say the same touching the obseruatiō of Ecclesiasticall policy, wherein the essence of piety consisteth not; and of all good works, touching the exterior action, as to giue almes, sing to the praise of God, &c. And which is more, we say that the vnregenerate man sinneth very freely, and without constraint, and betweene two euils chuseth very freely. And this is the same liberty which imposeth on him the necessity to sinne, because hee is naturally subject to his will, naturally euill. Therein consists his mischiefe, that he is too free to doe euill, so that his freedome is the cause of his seruitude. Now this necessity to sinne, is not repugnant to the freedome of the will. Witnesse the diuels, which are necessarily and naturally

wicked, and yet ſinne moſt freely and without conſtraint: So God is neceſſarily good, and yet moſt free. It is not neceſſity but conſtraint, that ouerthroweth the freedome of the will.

In all theſe things wee ſay, that vnregenerate men haue their free will and free choyce, onely the Word of God bereaueth them of this liberty, and calleth them bondſlaues, ſold to ſinne, yea, dead in ſinne, in regard of Chriſtian vertues which lead men vnto ſaluation; as the true knowledge of God, and of faith in Ieſus Chriſt, and of the true feare and loue of God, the end and purpoſe whereof is the glory of God, and the hope of ſaluation in Ieſus Chriſt. To all theſe things, man naturally hath no inclination, no moouing, nor no free will at all, as wee haue ſhewed by places of the Scripture. It ſhould bee hard in the good theefe crucified with Ieſus Chriſt, or in the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* before his conuerſion, to finde any preparations or diſpoſitions to conuert or turne vnto God: which preparations, our Aduerſaries call merits of congruity; which ſurely is a great incongruity in faith.

Rom. 7. 14. Ephes. 2. 1.

Touching the regenerate, and ſuch as are conducted and ſanctified by the Spirit of God, we are ſo farre off from ſaying that they do good by conſtraint, that on the contrary we ſay that they doe it willingly, and take pleaſure therein. He that doth good by conſtraint, doth euill. And God ſheweth mercy vnto him, if he pardoneth ſuch a diſobedience. Although God hateth euill, yet hee will not conſtraine men to goodneſſe, becauſe goodneſſe is no goodneſſe if it be not voluntary. But he boweth the wills of his children, and maketh them willing to worke with him. In ſuch manner neuertheleſſe, that all whatſoeuer they cooperate, and the will it ſelfe which they haue to doe good, proceedeth from God: *Which worketh in vs both the will and the deed, euen of his good pleaſure*, Phil. 2. 13. Euen as the infant formed in the wombe, ſtirreth of it ſelfe, and is an helpe to his owne conſeruation and birth, and yet all that vigour or ſtrength in him proceedeth from God: ſo is it with regeneration and ſpirituall birth. To giue

God

God all the praiſe and glory of our good workes, is not to hinder good works, no more than to giue God all the praiſe of the framing and birth of the child, is to hinder the birth of the childe, or to diminiſh his vigour. God preuenteth thoſe that will not, to make them will, and aydeth thoſe that will, that they may not will in vaine. He commandeth whatſoeuer he will, and doth that in vs which he commandeth: he doth it by a ſweet efficacy, and by an attraction without conſtraint, whereof Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh, Ioh. 6. 44. *No man can come to me, except the Father which hath ſent me draw him.* The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* Epheſ. 4. 24. ſaying, that *the new man is created after God vnto righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe*, calleth our regeneration a new creation. Now as in the creation, the imperatiue Words of God were operatiue: ſo in our regeneration, his Word is full of efficacy to transforme mens hearts. So when the Lord ſpake to the dead body of *Lazarus*, ſaying, *Lazarus, come forth*; by thoſe words he infuſed life into him againe. And as our Lord commanded the Iewes to vnbinde *Lazarus* bands wherewith he was bound, that hee might be looſe, ſo in the ſpirituall reſurrection, he vnbindeth vs from the ſeruitude of ſinne, that we may ſerue him freely, and with a good will. This is that which our Confeſſion ſaith, that man hath no freedome or will to doe good, but that which God giueth him. Then it acknowledgeth a freedome or will in the faithfull, but that it is a gift of God: which freedome being oppoſed and croſſed by the combate of concupiſcences, increaſeth as God augmenteth his graces, and as the worke of regeneration proceedeth in vs.

The ſumme of all that which is ſaid before, is this, that the vnregenerate man hath free will in naturall things, in ciuill things, and in wicked things, but not in diuine things which leade to ſaluation. As for the regenerate man, the good that he doth, he doth it voluntarily and without conſtraint: and in this ſence diuers anciẽt Fathers ſay, that the faithful haue free will: but if by hauing free will, we vnderſtand that it ſhould be in the free will of a man that is not regenerate to haue true faith, and to turne vnto God with hearty repentance, or

that the good which we do, and the faith in Ieſus Chriſt, and the true knowledge of God, partly proceede from our naturall forces, or that before regeneration there are preparations, diſpoſitions, and merits of congruity in man: (as Sophiſters prattle,) we reject that free will, as contrary to the Word of God, and not onely ſay, that God vnbindeth our will which is reſtrained, but that he wholly giueth the will and the force of motion to doe good. Our aduerſaries themſelues ſaying, that man can doe no good without Gods aſſiſtance, deny free will: for he is not free to goe, that cannot goe except the bands that bind him be vnbound, and without being holden vp after he hath been bound. They ſay, that in an vnregenerated man free will is bound and reſtrained: as much to the purpoſe, as if I ſhould ſay, that a free man is a bond-man. For how can the will be franke and free, if it be bound and reſtrained? Surely, he is not free, that being laid downe cannot riſe againe, if another man doth not lend him his hand. For the grace whereby God releeueth vs, is not in our diſpoſition; God doth not onely ſollicite our wills, by ſhewing obiects, or by propounding reaſons fit and proper to perſwade, but alſo giueth the deſire, and changeth the will. Hee doth with efficacy produce *to will and to doe according to his good pleaſure.* For if he changeth the hearts of his enemies, as the heart of *Eſau*, Geneſ. 33. 4. and of *Saul*, 1 Sam. 19. 23. and of the Egyptians, Pſal. 105. 25. And if hee holdeth the hearts of Kings to encline them as he will, Pro. 21. 1. how much more doth he touch the hearts of his Elect, to turne them vnto him with a voluntary conuerſion?

ARNOVX.

23. Sect. *Places quoted in the margent of the Confeſſion, Iohn* 1. 4, 5. *In it was life, and that life was the light of men, and that light ſhineth in darkneſſe, and the darkeneſſe comprehended it not. Is not this a mocking of the World, and an abuſing of mens ſoules, to ſet downe this place, thereby to conclude that a man can doe no good but by conſtraint, nor obey God by the freedome of a good will?*

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

I grant: for we ſet not downe this place, to proove that a man can doe no good but by conſtraint, but to proove that man naturally abideth in darkeneſſe. This man forgeth errours, to ſtriue and contend againſt them.

ARNOVX.

And are not ſinners (by good reaſon) called darkeneſſe, becauſe they refuſe the light which is offered vnto them? 24. Sect.

MOVLIN.

Adde thereunto: And becauſe that they are naturally plunged in darkeneſſe, not hauing any true knowledge of God by their owne nature.

ARNOVX.

Iohn 8. 37. Then if the Sonne make you free, you ſhall bee free indeed. I conclude to the contrary, The Sonne hath freed vs, and therefore wee are free. What doe theſe men by this allegation, but prouide armes to beate themſelues? 25. Sect.

MOVLIN.

I know not to whom this Doctor ſpeaketh: hee prooueth by this place, that wee are free after that Ieſus Chriſt hath made vs free. Who doubts that? and who euer denyed it? The queſtion is, whether we be bondſlaues, and without free-will in things which appertaine to ſaluation, before wee are freed by Ieſus Chriſt? M. *Arnoux* toucheth not that, but ſpends time in vnprofitable words.

Whether man by his free-will can chuſe goodneſſe?

ARNOVX.

Contrary paſſages, Deut. 30. 19. I call heauen and earth to record this day againſt you, that I haue ſet before you life and death, 26. Sect.

death, blessing and cursing: therefore chuse life, that thou and thy seed may liue. Note this word chuse: *can a man chuse without liberty, or by constraint?*

MOVLIN.

By this place the Iesuite disputeth not against vs, but against those that say, that we doe good by constraint. Therefore those that beleeue that, must answer him, and not wee, who therein agree with the Church of Rome.

Our aduersaries haue vsed to produce this place, to proone that it is in our power to chuse good, and to leaue euill: seeing that God saith, *chuse*: for (say they) God commandeth no impossible things. But they contradict themselues: for M. *Arnoux* said before, that man can doe no good thing without the grace of God. Now this grace of God is not in our power: we beare not the keyes of his treasures. God giueth not his graces to euery one, but to whom he will. Neuerthelesse, this commandement is giuen vnto all men, to chuse good, and to shun euill, & that to those that are not regenerated by the grace of the Spirit of God, euen to Pagans and Infidels. Behold then, by the confession of our aduersaries, men that cannot obey this commandement which is giuen vnto them, because they haue not the grace of God, without the which we can doe no good that tendeth to saluation.

That which maketh our aduersaries to confound one another, and not to vnderstand themselues, is a false presupposition which they make, that man by his free will can doe all that which God commandeth: which is a maxime that wee must banish out of Diuinity. For God in the Gospell commandeth vs to haue faith in Iesus Christ: and yet Saint *Paul*, Ephesians 2. 8. saith, *This faith commeth not from our selues, but it is a gift of God.* God by his Prophet, Ezekiel 18.31. *commandeth vs to make vs new hearts*: but he himselfe by the same Prophet 36.26. declareth, that it is hee that giueth a new heart and a new spirit, that taketh away the heart of stone, and giueth a heart of flesh.

God in his Law speaketh to all men, for the Law is our naturall

naturall debt: and yet it is a thing granted by all men, that without being inſtructed in the Word of God, it is impoſſible to accompliſh it; and there are an infinite number of people to whom the Word of God is not preached, who neuertheleſſe are bound to accompliſh the Law.

This proofe is demonſtratiue, that if by our free will wee cannot diſpoſe of the grace without the which wee cannot obey God, nor doe that good which ſerueth to ſaluation, that alſo by this free will we cannot obey God, nor doe that good which ſerueth to ſaluation. Then let Mr. *Arnoux* learne, that the Law of God is not a proofe of our ability, but of our duty; and that he which asketh a man that which he oweth him, is not vniuſt, although the debtor be become vnable by his owne fault. And if the debtor be become poore by his owne prodigality, yet thereby hee is not leſſe bound to pay: and the creditor that will be payed, conſiders him not as rich or poore, but as a debtor. So it is in this caſe, for God had created man righteous, and by his free will able to chuſe good or euill. By his owne fall he hath loſt this righteouſneſſe, and by bad vſing of his free will, loſt both it and himſelfe. So that if by his owne fault he is become vnable to fulfill the Law of God, is God vniuſt to aske him that which he oweth? ſeeing that God commanding him to keepe the Law, ſpeaketh not to him as to a righteous man, nor as to a ſinner, but ſimply as to a naturall man, bound to this obedience.

Aug. Enchir. ad Laurentium cap. 30. Libero arbitrio homo male vtens, ſe perdidit, & ipſum namq; libero peccatore arbitrio, viſſore peccato, amiſſum eſt liberum arbitrium.

In which rigour the mercy of God is admirable. For in exacting from a corrupt man, a perfect righteouſneſſe which he cannot accompliſh, hee maketh him afraid, and by this feare driues him to Ieſus Chriſt, who hath payed this debt for all thoſe that beleeue in him. God asking vs that which we cannot do, teacheth vs what we ſhould aske him, and that which Chriſt Ieſus hath done for vs. *Quod Lex imperat, fides impetrat*: That which the Law commandeth, faith obtaineth of the goodneſſe of God by prayer.

Aug. Ep. 89.

ARNOVX.

To Philemon verſe 14. I would doe nothing without thy mind, 27. Sect.

that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but as willingly. Note this last as to be added for the pleasure of the Translators. In the originall you have simply and without constraint, willingly: *but that importeth not much, seeing that this word restraineth not, but expresseth the manner that Saint Paul requireth to be observed in the good action of his Disciple, which is freedome and liberty.*

MOVLIN.

We hold with M. *Arnoux*, that the good which Saint *Paul* required of *Philemon*, ought simply to be voluntary, and without constraint. The word *as*, added in our translation, is not contrary to that, but we were forced to adde the same, to shun an harshnesse of phrase, which the French tongue cannot beare: as for example, If the Apostle had said in the Greeke, that Iesus Christ suffered not as God, but man, he translateth truely that saith, Iesus suffered not as God, but as man. If I should say, that a French man ought to be apparelled, not as the Spaniards, but the Frenchmen, I should speak against our manner of speech, and must necessarily adde thereunto *as*, and say as the French men. And therfore whereas *Paul* according to the Greeke saith, to the end that thy good should not be as by constraint, but voluntary, it was necessary in French to translate, but as voluntary. M. *Arnoux* himselfe iustifieth vs, saying, that it importeth not much.

ARNOVX.

28. Sect. *I could quote an hundred and an hundred places, wherewith the Scripture floweth, to iustifie this truth; without which, hell, Paradise, the preaching of the Word, the exhortations, threatnings, and all that whereof wee beleeue of the efficacy of the grace whereby God disposeth of vs with awfull obseruance, and maketh vs worke effectually: but as mildly drawing vs without violence, were in vaine.*

MOVLIN.

All that is good against those, that hold that wee doe no good but by constraint, but not against vs, which onely say, that God vseth the preaching of the Gospell, and exhortations

tions and threatnings, with efficacy to touch our hearts, that voluntarily, and without constraint they might be moued to serue him.

THE TENTH ARTICLE.

We beleeue that all the generation of *Adam* is infected with this contagion, which is originall sin, and an hereditary vice, and not onely an imitation as the Pelagians say; whose errors we detest, and think it not necessary to enquire how sinne comes from one man to another, because it is certaine, that that which God gaue him, was not for himselfe onely, but for all his generation: and so, that in him we haue beene bereaued of all goodnesse, and are fallen into all pouerty and malediction.

Mr. *Arnoux* alloweth this article, and findeth nothing therein to be reprooued.

THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE.

Vpon which Mr. Arnoux mooueth the question, touching originall sinne after Baptisme.

We beleeue that this vice is certainly sinne, which is sufficient to condemne all mankind, euen little children, as soone as they come out of their mothers wombe; and that it is so reputed before God, namely, that after Baptisme it is alwaies sinne, as touching the fault, although the condemnation is abolished in the children

children of God, not imputing the ſame vnto them by his free mercy, as alſo that it is a peruerſity alwayes producing fruites of malice and rebellion, (ſuch as that the moſt holieſt (although they ſtriue againſt it) are not without ſpots of infirmities and faults, while they are heere on earth.

ARNOVX.

29. Sect. *Can there be any thing ſaid more contrary to the myſtery of our redemption, and the greatneſſe of the Sacraments of the new Law, for that both the one and the other are made of no effect? If the Sonne of God by his death, which by Baptiſme is applied vnto vs, was not of force to withdraw vs from the death of ſinne, but hath left vs buried in the filthineſſe of the old man, and hath not truely regenerated vs, nor made vs acceptable to his Father, before whom wee are ſtill abominable, while the faults for which his Sonne died remaineth in vs and defileth vs.*

MOVLIN.

All theſe words tend to ſhew, that all thoſe that are baptized haue no more originall ſinne, and by conſequence haue no more actuall ſinne: for all our wicked actions proceed from our corrupt nature.

This matter is of great importance. For the knowledge of the corruption of our nature, maketh vs know the neceſſity of the grace of God. If wee did not know what euill it is to be borne in *Adam*, wee would not know what good it is to be borne againe in Ieſus Chriſt. We muſt neceſſarily know the miſery of our naturall generation, before we proceed to our ſpirituall regeneration.

This naturall corruption is called originall ſinne, becauſe we haue it from our birth. This ſinne is an hereditary euill, which conſiſteth in the deprination of originall righteouſneſſe, and in an inclination to euill. This corruption is fallen vpon man by propagation, and is come vpon vs from our firſt father, whoſe tranſgreſſion is imputed to all mankinde, becauſe

becauſe *Adam* did not ſinne as a particular man, but as repreſenting all humane kinde, both in his beginning and originall. The benefits which hee had receiued for himſelfe and his poſterity, hee loſt for himſelfe and his poſterity. The crime of treaſon cõmitted by the father, diſparageth alſo his poſterity. And by all humane Lawes, children are charged with their fathers debt. But herein there is a difference, that for debts children may renounce their patrimony, but men cannot renounce this hereditary corruption, becauſe originall ſinne is not only a debt, but alſo an hereditary contagion and diſeaſe: as when a leproſie ſeizeth vpon a whole generation.

Circumciſion in the old Teſtament, and Baptiſme in the new Teſtament, are ſilent confeſſions of originall ſinne: for by theſe Sacraments conferred to little children, the Church confeſſeth, that there is ſome ſuperfluous thing in them to cut off, and that they are borne into the world with ſpots and filthineſſe, the which they deſire to haue waſhed away by the grace of God in Ieſus Chriſt.

Becauſe of this originall ſinne, children are ſubject to dye, although they haue not actually ſinned: euen as wee breake the egges of Aſpes, although they neuer bit nor infected any man, becauſe that out of them there would come venimous ſerpents; ſoa childe dieth juſtly, although it hath not actually ſinned: but it is ſufficient that his nature is vicious, nd will one day diſcloſe and bring forth ſinne, which is there already in power and in his originall. For originall ſinne is the ground of all actuall ſinnes: that is it which maketh man by nature vncapable to obey the Law of God. *Dauid* confeſſeth that hee was conceiued in that ſinne, Pſalme 51. And our aduerſaries confeſſe, that Saint *Paul* the Apoſtle acknowledgeth, that That ſinne remained in him, Rom. 7. 17. With this corruption not onely the children of pagans and infidels, but alſo the children of the faithfull and true Chriſtians are borne: becauſe they beget children not as they are faithfull, but as they are men. Piety is not hereditary, it comes not by nature, but by grace: it is not generation, but regeneration that makes the faithfull. So vnder the Law, a circumci-

ſed

fed man begat a child with the foreskin: in the same manner that graine of corne which is cleane, bringeth foorth other corne with the huske and straw. If any man hath vicious children, he ought in them to acknowledge his owne nature; if he hath wise and vertuous children, he ought in them to acknowledge the worke of God. That is it which Saint *Iohn* teacheth vs, 1 chap. 13. where he saith, *That those that beleeue in Iesus Christ, are not borne of bloud, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*

God furnisheth his elect with a double remedy, or helpe against this originall sinne; The one is the remission of all our sins by Iesus Christ; the other is the regeneration and interiour renewing by the holy Ghost: which changing is another birth, and a conformation of a new man, made according to the Image of the Sonne of God. Of these two benefits Baptisme is a seale, by the which the benefit Iesus Christ is applied vnto vs: as Saint *Marke* in the beginning of his Gospell teacheth vs, where he saith, *Saint Iohn preached the baptisme of repentance, for remission of sinnes*: ioyning these two benefits to baptisme, to wit, repentance, which is regeneration, with the remission of sinnes.

Whereupon wee are at difference with the Church of Rome: in that she saith, that children that are baptized, haue no more originall sinne, and that Baptisme wholly aboliſheth that sinne. We on the contrary say, that children that are baptized, are yet spotted with that sinne, but that God imputeth it not, but pardoneth it for Iesus Christs sake; whereof the benefit is applyed vnto vs by Baptisme.

Our doctrine is grounded vpon the holy Scriptures, vpon the nature of God, vpon experience, and vpon the confession of the aduersaries.

1 In the fifty one Psalme and fifth verse, the Prophet *Dauid* confessing his sinnes, acknowledgeth from whence this euill hapned vnto him, that is, from his originall corruption, saying, *Behold, I was shaped in iniquity, and in sinne did my mother conceiue mee.* Now *Dauid* was circumcised, and then circumcision was in place of Baptisme.

2 The

2 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* was baptized and regenerated. Now our Aduerſaries confeſſe, that in the ſeuenth chapter to the Romanes hee ſpeaketh of himſelfe, and that in the ſeuenteenth verſe he acknowledgeth, that *Sinne dwelleth in him.* And in the fourteenth verſe, *I am carnall, ſold vnder ſinne.* The Councell of Trent, in the fift Seſſion holdeth, that Saint *Paul* ſpeaketh of the regenerate man. Behold then, a man baptized and regenerate, in whom (by the confeſſion of our Aduerſaries) ſinne dwelt, and that yet had naturall corruption in him; which did in ſuch manner torment the Fathers in the Councell of Trent, that they found no other meanes to ſaue themſelues, than by giuing the lye to Saint *Paul*, ſaying, that that which Saint *Paul* calleth ſinne, to ſpeake truly and properly, is no ſinne, in men borne againe, that is to ſay, baptized. It is to no purpoſe to produce examples, whereby to proue that this word *Sinne* is taken figuratiuely, either for ſacrifice, or for occaſion of ſinne; for to this ſinne whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the ſeuenth chapter, things are attributed which properly belong vnto ſinne, that is, to be condemned in the Law, to doe euill, to dwell in man, and to fight and ſtriue againſt the Law of God which is in the minde.

3 In the third chapter of the ſame Epiſtle, verſe 9, and 10. the ſame Apoſtle maintaineth, that all, *both Iewes and Gentiles are vnder ſinne, as it is written, There is none righteous, no not one.* Now the Iewes were circumciſed, and many among the Gentiles were baptized.

4 Therefore the ſame Apoſtle, Coloſſians, chapter 2. verſe 13. ſaith well, that *God freely pardoneth all our offences*: but ſaith not, that in this life God maketh vs perfectly righteous and without ſinne. And Saint Iohn, chapter 1. verſes 7, 8. of his firſt Epiſtle, after hee had ſaid, that *The blood of Ieſus Chriſt cleanſeth vs from all ſinne*: leſt that any man thereby ſhould preſume that hee is without ſinne, hee addeth, *If wee ſay that wee haue not ſinne, wee deceiue our ſelues, and truth is not in vs.*

5 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* to the Romanes, chap. 6. ver. 23. ſaith,

ſaith, that *The wages of ſinne is death.* Then the death of a man is a certaine proofe that hee is ſpotted and defiled with ſinne. Now diuers little children die after they are baptized before they haue committed any actuall ſinne: then neceſſarily they are ſpotted with ſinne; which ſinne conſequently, muſt be Originall ſinne, ſeeing they haue not yet done any actuall ſinne.

6 In the twelfth verſe of the ſame chapter he ſaith, *Let not ſinne therefore reigne in your mortall bodies, that yee ſhould obey it in the luſts thereof.* Theſe words are a ſilent confeſsion that ſin dwelleth in vs, and an exhortation to hinder it from hauing the vpper hand, and that dwelling in vs, as it is ſaid in the chapter following, it ſhould not reigne in vs.

7 Experience alſo proueth it. For if fathers and mothers that are baptized haue no Originall ſinne, how comes it then that children are borne in Originall ſinne? How can fathers and mothers giue that to their children which they haue not?

8 Likewiſe, doe wee not ordinarily ſee little children, after they are baptized, to be peruerſe and vncorrigible? They are all naturally inclined to lie. We ſee a peruerſe humour in them: the loue and the reuerence which they beare to their babies, are euident ſeeds of Idolatry. From whence ſhould this peruerſity enter into them, but only by their corrupt nature, ſeeing they could not haue learned it by example?

9 Whoſoeuer taketh away a cauſe which can onely produce an effect, taketh away the effect alſo. Now naturall corruption, which is Originall ſinne, is the cauſe of all euill actions. Then that being taken away, by conſequence alſo all euill actions are taken away. But ſeeing that after baptiſme euill actions appeare, it is certaine that Originall ſinne is not aboliſhed.

10 If a man that is baptized becommeth prophane and impious, hath he not originall ſinne? hath he not that corruption and inclination to euill that he brought into the world? If he hath it, how is it come againe after he loſt it in Baptiſm? If he hath it not, how is he ſo much inclined to euill?

11 I leaue a great number of places in the holy Scriptures which condemne all men, euen the moſt righteous, to be ſinners, and ſummon the moſt perfect that are in the church of Rome, to the teſtimony of their owne conſciences. For who is he among them that is not oftentimes mooued with pride and choler, and infected with euill deſires? What is he that loueth his God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himſelfe? What is he among them that doth not ſometimes lye, ſeeing that the Scripture which lyeth not, ſaith that all men are liers? Pſal. 116. After they haue diſputed againſt vs, each of them is ſeuerally to diſpute againſt himſelfe, and to gainſay the teſtimony of his owne conſcience.

12 Doe not they themſelues, with the Councell of Trent, confeſſe that concupiſcence remaineth after baptiſme? This concupiſcence is ſinne; for that S. *Paul* to the Romanes chap. 7. verſe 7. calleth it ſinne, hauing learned that of the law, which ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not couet.* For Saint Iohn in his firſt Epiſtle, third chapter, and fourth verſe ſaith, *Sinne is the tranſgreſſion of the Law.* To thinke to deceiue or mocke the commandement of God, and ſuch expreſſe words of the Apoſtle, by a diſtinction forged in Schooles, is to leaue nothing certaine in the Word of God. Our Aduerſaries ſay, that concupiſcence is ſinne when it hath a reſolute deſire or will to offend God, but if it be but motions without reſolution, and without determination, that it is no ſinne. Remembring not that when they ſay ſo, they contradict themſelues, and injure Saint *Paul* the Apoſtle. For our Aduerſaries confeſſe, that Saint *Paul* acknowledgeth that this concupiſcence which he calleth Sinne, remaineth in him. Now would they ſay, that Saint *Paul* had a determinate will to ſinne, or that hee tooke pleaſure to offend God?

That concupiſcence it ſelfe, without a ſtayed reſolution to ſin, is ſinne.

13 Moreouer, that God commanding vs to loue and ſerue him with all our hearts, by conſequence forbiddeth the inſtigations and motions of euill deſires, which can haue no being when the heart is wholly poſſeſſed with the Spirit of God: Whereupon alſo Ieſus Chriſt, nor the bleſſed Saints in heauen haue not thoſe concupiſcences.

14 Rea-

14 Reason also is therein most manifest, for hee is put to death, that hath neuer so little conferred with the enemy to betray a Towne, although hee hath not proceeded to a resolute will to execute that treason. And a maid that giueth eare vnto vnchast temptations, maketh a breach in her credit, although shee hath not proceeded to a full resolution to doe euill. Yet these men affirme, that concupiscence which tempteth and solliciteth man to offend God, is not sin, so that the will consent not thereunto, and that men proceed not to a full resolution. If the will did holily to resist concupiscence, concupiscence did wickedly to tempt and sollicite the will.

15 Behold, the Apostle, who (by our aduersaries confession) speaking of this concupiscence, saith, that by it hee doth the euill that he would not, Rom. 7. 19. and that it fighteth against the law of his minde, verse 23. that is, against the law of God printed in his mind. How then dare they say, that to do euill, is no sinne? and that to resist against the Law of God and to striue against it, is no offence to God?

16 If concupiscence without resolute will is no sinne after baptisme, much lesse then is it sinne in children before baptisme, when man is wholly without actuall vse of his will.

17. To this euill the question is to find a remedy: which remedy ought not to be forged in our owne braines, but to be found in the Word of God, wherein wee finde these two remedies. The one, that all our sinnes are pardoned by Iesus Christ, and by consequence Originall sinne. The other, that God regenerateth vs by his holy Spirit, to cause sinne to reigne no more in vs, touching our hearts with repentance. Of these two benefits, baptisme is a Sacrament. Thus *Iohn baptized the baptisme of repentance for remission of sinnes*, Marke 1. 4. But that Originall sinne should be abolished by baptisme, the Word of God saith not so. It is an opinion contradicted by the Word of God, and by experience.

Colos. 2. 13. Acts 10. 43. 1 Iohn 1. 7.

18 Hereby Mr. *Arnaux* allegation is refuted, which imposeth vpon vs, that wee say, that Iesus Christ by his death applied by baptisme, could not draw vs from the death of sin, and leaueth vs buried in the corruption of the old man, and doth

doth not truly regenerate vs: which is to make vs say the contrary vnto that which we beleeue. By the full remiſſion of ſins applyed in baptiſme, God draweth vs from death; and by the Spirit of regeneration he beginneth life in vs: which is not perfected all at once, but goeth forward by degrees; which doth not hinder vs from being acceptable vnto God, nor that he ſhould not acknowledge vs for his adopted and redeemed children in Ieſus Chriſt.

19 S. *Auguſtine* is very reſolute in this matter, in the booke of Marriage and of Concupiſcence, Chap. 25. and 26. * *Concupiſcence, ſaith he, is pardoned in baptiſme, not to the end that it ſhould be no more, but becauſe it ſhould not bee imputed for ſinne.* A great part of the booke againſt *Iulian* is written to proue that *Concupiſcentia rimittitur in reatu, & manet in actu: that concupiſcence touching the guiltineſſe in man is remitted, and yet remaineth touching the act or actually.* Hee often repeateth that this original corruption is remitted in baptiſme, and that *Lex peccati remiſſa eſt in regeneratione ſpirituali, & manet in carne mortali: The law of ſin is pardoned in ſpirituall regeneration, but remaineth in mortall fleſh.* And in the fift booke againſt *Iulian*, Chap. 3. * *Concupiſcence of the fleſh, (againſt the which the good Spirit fighteth) is ſinne, becauſe it is diſobedience againſt the law of the minde: and a paine for ſinne, becauſe it is returned backe againe for the merits of the diſobedient; and a cauſe of ſinne, by the fault of the conſenter, or by the contagion of originall ſinne.* And in the 41. Treatiſe vpon Saint *Iohn*: * *The Apoſtle ſaith not that there is no more ſinne. As long as thou liueſt, it is neceſſary that ſinne ſhould be in thy members, but let vs ſtriue to keepe it from reigning in vs.* In all theſe places this holy man acknowledgeth, that after baptiſme, ſtill concupiſcence is ſinne, ſeeing we haue neede that God ſhould pardon it, and that after baptiſme ſinne remaineth yet in vs.

Thomas the * father of ſchollers, vpon the fourth Chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans, in his 1. leſſon is reſolute there-

* *Dimitti concupiſcentiam carnis in baptiſmo, non vt non ſit, ſed vt ijs peccatum non imputetur.*

* *Concupiſcentia carnis, aduerſus quam bonus concupiſcit ſpiritus & peccatū eſt, quia illi ineſt inobedientia contra dominatum mentis, & pœna peccati eſt, quia reddita eſt meritis inobedientis & cauſa peccati, &c.*

* *Non ait, non ſit, ſed non regnet. Quamdiu viuis, peccatum neceſſe eſt eſſe in membris tuis. Saltem illi reg-*

uum auferatur. * *Peccatum originale remitti dicitur, quia tranſit reatus ſuperueniente gratia, ſed remanet actu, remanente fomite ſiue concupiſcentia.*

in, saying, *It is said that originall sinne is remitted, because the obligation of the paine is abolished, grace helping, but it remaineth in effect.*

ARNOVX.

30. Sect. *Places quoted in the margent of the Confession,* Rom. 7. 7. *What shall wee say then? is the Law sinne? God forbid, nay, I knew not sinne but by the Law: for I had not knowne lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not lust.*

I am abashed, that they recite this place, wherein neither baptisme, condemnation, imputation, nor any distinction betweene poena & culpa *is once spoken of. And yet they quote but this one text onely: whereby the Apostle plainly sheweth the weakenesse of the Law, which sheweth sinne and cannot heale it, and the point of our rebellion, which is augmented by the only opposition of the Law: to the end that by these two points we might comprehend the necessity of grace, which bridling concupiscence, giueth the Law the vpper hand, and maketh vs obedient vnto it.*

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux falsification. This place thus confounded hath neede of an Interpreter. We haue already aduertised M. *Arnoux*, that there is a fault in the cypher of the place quoted, and that the seuenth verse is set for the seuenteenth verse, where S. *Paul* acknowledgeth, *that sinne dwelleth in him.* Now Saint *Paul* was baptized. Then this is an expresse example of a man that was baptized, in whom neuertheleſſe ſinne dwelt. Is there any thing clearer or more certaine then this proofe, against the which, in stead of touching it, M. *Arnoux* lifts vp his spirit, & takes a wrong flight, in affected words farre from the question.

ARNOVX.

31. Sect. *Contrary text; 1 Cor. 6. 11. Such were some of you: he meaneth fornicators, Idolaters, adulterers, wantons, filthy, theeues, couetous, drunkards, raylers, extortioners, and in a word, full of sinne: but you haue beene washed, but you haue beene sanctified, but you haue beene iustified. Could he more formerly declare the*

effect of baptisme, and the annihilating of sinne?

MOVLIN.

This place is chopt, which is a kinde of falsification. M. *Arnoux* alledgeth this place, to proue that those that are baptized, haue no more originall sinne, and that it is aboliſhed by baptisme; and therfore he clipt off and suppreſſed the laſt line of this verſe, by the which it might be known, that in it Saint *Paul* spake not of baptisme: *You haue been* (saith the Apoſtle) *waſhed, you haue beene ſanctified, you haue beene iuſtified in the name of Ieſus Chriſt, and by the Spirit of our God.* Hee attributeth theſe effects of ſaluation to the vertue of Ieſus Chriſt, and to the efficacie of his Spirit, which we ought not to reſtraine to baptisme, whereof in all that Chapter there is no mention made. M. Arnoux falsification.

ARNOVX.

And Rom. 6. 11. *and in all places: Likewiſe thinke you alſo that you are dead to ſinne, but are aliue to God in Ieſus Chriſt our Lord. And a little before, verſe 2. How ſhall we that are dead to ſin, liue yet therin? For if we be ingraffed with him to the ſimilitude of his death by baptiſme, whereof he commeth to ſpeake, euen ſo ſhall we be to the ſimilitude of his reſurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of ſinne might bee deſtroyed,* (Note deſtroyed) *that henceforth we ſhould not ſerue ſin, for he that is dead, is freed from ſinne.* 32. Still.

MOVLIN.

Theſe places ſerue to fill vp roome, and would be as well elſewhere. Where haue you one word therein touching that which he would vrge? that is, that thoſe that are baptized, haue no originall ſinne? How abſurd ſhould I be, if I ſhould argue in this manner: We are baptized, to the end that wee ſhould attaine to eternall life; then we obtaine eternall life, as ſoone as we are baptized? And yet this is M. *Arnoux* diſcourſe, who produceth the graces which wee receiue of Ieſus Chriſt, to perſwade vs that we receiue the perfections of

theſe graces at our baptiſme: although we be baptized to the end to deſtroy ſinne, it followeth not, that the entire deſtruction is perfected in baptiſme, which is one of the meanes to attaine to perfection.

THE TWELFTH ARTICLE.

We beleeue that God withdraweth from this corruption and generall condemnation whereinto all men are plunged, all thoſe whom in his eternall and vnmoueable counſell hee hath choſen of his onely goodneſſe and mercy in Ieſus Chriſt our Lord; without cõſideration of their works, leauing the reſt in the ſame corruption and condemnation; in them to ſhew his iuſtice, as in the firſt hee maketh the riches of his mercy to ſhine: for one is not better then another, vntill it pleaſeth God to diſcerne them according to his vnmouable counſell, which he hath determined in Ieſus Chriſt before the beginning of the world: and no man alſo may thruſt himſelfe into ſuch a good by his owne vertue, ſeeing that by nature wee cannot haue one onely good motion, affection, nor thought, vntill God hath preuented vs, and hath diſpoſed vs thereunto.

THE THIRTEENTH ARTICLE.

We beleeue that in the ſame Ieſus Chriſt, all that which was required to ſaluation, hath been offered & communicated vnto vs: who being giuen vs for ſaluation, hath thereby been made vnto vs, wiſedom, righteouſneſſe,

teouſneſſe, ſanctification, and redemption; in ſuch manner, that declining from him, wee renounce the mercy of God, whereunto we ought to haue our onely refuge.

THE FOVRTEENTH ARTICLE.

Wee beleeue that Ieſus Chriſt, being the wiſedome of God, and his eternall Sonne, tooke our fleſh vpon him, to be God and man in one perſon, yea man like vnto vs, ſuffering in body and ſoule, onely that he was pure and without ſin. And touching his humanity, that he was the true ſeed of *Abraham* and of *Dauid*, although he was conceiued by the ſecret vertue of the holy Spirit. Wherein we deteſt all the hereſies which anciently haue troubled the Church, and ſpecially the diabolicall imaginations of *Seruetus*, who attributeth to Ieſus Chriſt a fantaſticall diuinity, ſaying, that he is the *Idea* & patterne of all things, and nameth him the perſonall, or figuratiue Sonne of God; and finally forgeth him a body of three vncreated elements, and ſo mixeth and deſtroyeth both the two natures.

THE FIFTEENTH ARTICLE.

Wee beleeue, that in one ſelfe-ſame perſon, that is, Ieſus Chriſt, the two natures are truely and vnſeparably ioyned and vnited, each of the natures neuertheleſſe remaining in their diſtinct propertie: In

ſuch ſort, that as in this coniunction the diuine nature retaining his property, continued vncreated, infinite, and filling all things, ſo the humane nature continued finite, hauing his forme, meaſure, and propriety. And alſo, although Ieſus Chriſt when he roſe again, gaue immortality to his body, yet he tooke not from it the truth of his nature. And ſo wee conſider him in ſuch ſort in his diuinity, that wee bereaue him not of his humanity.

THE SIXTEENTH ARTICLE.

We beleeue that God ſending his Sonne, ſhewed his loue and ineſtimable goodneſſe towards vs, by deliuering him to death, and raiſing him againe, to fulfill all righteouſneſſe, and to obtaine eternall life for vs.

THE SEVENTEENTH ARTICLE.

Where M. Arnoux moueth the queſtion touching the imputation of the righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt.

We beleeue, that by the only ſacrifice which Ieſus Chriſt offered vpon the croſſe, we are reconciled to God, to be holden and reputed iuſt before him; becauſe we could not be pleaſing vnto God, nor be participants of his adoption, vnleſſe he forgaue our ſinnes and buried them. So we profeſſe that Ieſus Chriſt is our intire and perfect waſhing: and that in his death we haue intire ſatisfaction, to acquit vs of our ſinnes and

and iniquities, whereof we are guilty, and cannot be deliuered but by this meanes.

ARNOVX.

That is as much to ſay, as that the Sonne of God doth not truly make vs iuſt, nor worthy to be beloued of his Father, but leauing vs in the filthineſſe of ſinne, he anſwereth for vs, to the end that his Father ſhould not execute his vengeance vpon vs: and in a word, it maketh vs to be accounted good and righteous, or rather vſed ſo, although in effect we are vniuſt, wicked, and full of ſinne. Whereby it followeth, that not onely God deceiueth himſelfe, reputing them to bee iuſt that are not, but may be by his grace: which is not ſo feeble and weake, but that it can make them iuſt: ſeeing that the Apoſtle, Rom. 5. 20. ſaith, Where ſinne abounded, there grace abounded much more. 33. Sect.

That the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt is imputed vnto vs.

MOVLIN.

To know the truth of our beleefe, wee neede but take the contrary to that which M. *Arnoux* attributeth vnto vs: for he is ſworne neuer to report the truth of our beleefe.

Then to ſet downe the truth of our doctrine, and the point of the difference: we ſay that by the obedience which Ieſus Chriſt yeelded to his Father, we are made righteous, and that the righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt is ours, becauſe it is imputed and allowed vnto thoſe that beleeue in Ieſus Chriſt. On the contrary, the Church of Rome ſaith, that man is iuſtified by his owne workes. *Bellarmine* in the firſt booke of Iuſtification, cap. 2. ſaith, that the forme of iuſtification is charity. And in truth this word, *iuſtification*, among our aduerſaries is taken for regeneration or ſanctification, and for the ſtudy of good workes. And therefore the Councell of Trent in the ſixt Seſſion, ſetteth downe diuers increaſings and degrees of iuſtification.

In this matter we agree with our aduerſaries in two things:

The first, that good workes are necessary to saluation, and that God acknowledgeth not those men to be iust, that continue and take pleasure in doing euill. The second is, that the question is not touching that iustice whereby we are iustified before men, but of that whereby God acknowledgeth vs to be iust, and by the vertue whereof we may stand before him at the day of Iudgement.

The Word of God teacheth vs, that this righteousnesse which iustifieth vs before God, is the righteousnesse of Iesus Christ, wherby he hath satisfied for vs, yeelding himselfe culpable, to the end that we might be absolued; lading himselfe with our sinnes, to the end that his righteousnesse and obedience might be imputed, allowed, and reckoned vnto vs.

The Apostle Saint *Paul*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. saith, *God hath made him to be sinne for vs which knew no sinne, that wee should be made the righteousnesse of God through him.* And Romans 5. 19. *By the obedience of one man, many are made righteous*: And in the 18. verse he teacheth, that the righteousnesse of Iesus Christ iustifieth vs, saying, that *The iustifying of One doth iustifie vs.* If by iustifying, we must here vnderstand sanctifying, or regenerating, the Apostle would haue attributed this iustification to the Spirit of God, and not to the obedience of Iesus Christ, which iustifieth vs, because that by it we are absolued, and acknowledged to be righteous before God, as if we our selues had accomplished this righteousnesse. For seeing that our Aduersaries confesse, that our sinnes haue been imputed to Iesus Christ, why doe they find it strange that the righteousnesse of Iesus Christ should be imputed vnto vs, seeing our sinnes were imputed vnto Iesus Christ to no other end, but that his righteousnesse should be imputed vnto vs? * So they acknowledge, that the sinne of the first *Adam* is imputed to vs, and yet find fault that the righteousnesse of the second *Adam* should be imputed vnto vs: notwithstanding that the second *Adam*, which is Iesus Christ, came to no other end, but to remedy the euill that entred by the first *Adam*, bringing thereunto a contrary remedy.

* Bellarm. de amiss. gratiæ & statu peccati, l. 5. c. 17. Peccatum Adami nobis cõmunicatur per generationem, eo modo quo communicari potest id quod transit, nimirum per imputationem, omnibus enim imputatur qui in Adamo nascuntur.

And which is more, the Church of Rome by the doctrine of superabundant

ſuperabundant ſatisfactions, gathered in the treaſure of the Church, whereof the Pope hath the keyes, will haue the faſtings, ſtripes, and paines of the Saints, to be imputed and reckoned vnto thoſe that buy or get pardons; and in the meane time they chaſe and ſtorme when wee ſay, that the obedience and the ſufferings of Ieſus Chriſt are imputed vnto vs.

The ſame Apoſtle, Romanes 4.6. ſaith, *That God imputeth righteouſneſſe without workes:* ſpeaking of *Abraham* already regenerated, to whom hee ſaith that faith was imputed for righteouſneſſe. Then *Abraham* was iuſtified, not by the works of regeneration, but by another righteouſneſſe which is imputed vnto him. Now what this righteouſneſſe is, hee himſelfe declares afterward in the eighteenth and nineteenth verſes of the Chapter following, where he ſpeaketh of *one only iuſtifying iuſtice*, and ſaith, that *By the obedience of One, many ſhall be made righteous.* Where he ſpeaketh of the obedience of Ieſus Chriſt.

The ſame Apoſtle in Rom. 4.5. ſaith, that *Faith is counted for righteouſneſſe.* Whereupon I aske, which of theſe two (to ſpeake properly) is imputed vnto vs for righteouſneſſe, whether faith in Ieſus Chriſt, inaſmuch as it is inherent in vs, or the righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt apprehended by faith? It is certain that faith, foraſmuch as it is a vertue inherent in vs, cannot be imputed vnto vs: for our vertues and our actions are not imputed vnto vs, but another mans, when they are allowed and reckoned vnto vs, as if we had done them. As alſo, that to beleeue, of its owne nature is not a righteouſneſſe: much leſſe to beleeue according to the faith of the Romiſh Church, which is, but to beleeue that all that which God hath ſaid, is true; which is a beleefe that the diuels haue, and more certainly then men. It reſteth then, that faith is imputed vnto vs for righteouſneſſe, becauſe it apprehendeth and laieth hold vpon the righteouſnes and the benefit of Ieſus Chriſt, by the which we are iuſtified, that is, abſolued and quit before the Iudgement ſeat of God. And ſo faith iuſtifieth, in the ſame manner that the mouth feedeth man, becauſe it taketh and

receiueth

receiueth in the meate, but to ſpeake properly, it is the meate which nouriſheth.

For theſe cauſes the Prophet *Ieremy*, in the twenty three Chapter and verſe the ſixt, calleth our Sauiour, *The Lord our righteouſneſſe*. And the Apoſtle to the Philippians, Chapter 3. verſe 9. deſired *to be found in Ieſus Chriſt, not hauing* (ſaith he) *mine owne righteouſneſſe which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Ieſus Chriſt.*

For alſo, when we ſhall appeare before the Iudgement ſeate of God, by the vertue of our righteouſneſſe to obtaine eternall life, what ſhall wee preſent vnto God? Shall we preſent our owne righteouſneſſe, which is like a menſtruous cloth? Eſay 64. 6. our imperfect perfections, and our merits, which are no merits? Certainly God receiueth no payment if it be not perfect. God forbid that he ſhould weigh our good workes in the exact ballance of his juſtice. Then we muſt preſent vnto him a perfect righteouſneſſe, which is able to endure the examination of the juſtice of God. Such is the moſt complete righteouſneſſe which Ieſus Chriſt hath accompliſhed for vs, and the payment which he hath made, that it might bee allowed vnto vs.

τί ἄλλο τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἢ ἕνα ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀνεύρετον δικαιοσύνην; ἐν τίνι δικαιωθῆναι τοὺς ἀνόμους ἢ μᾶς χρηστότης ἑνὸς μόνου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἀναμάρτητα πολλῶν ἐν δικαίῳ ἑνὶ κρυβῇ, δικαιοσύνη δὲ ἑνὸς πολλὰς ἀνομίας δικαιώσῃ.

So *Iuſtin Martyr* ſaid aboue foureteene hundred yeeres paſt, in an Epiſtle to *Diogenetus*, *What other thing could couer our ſinnes, but the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt? In whom can we that are impious and wicked be iuſtified, but in the onely Sonne of God? O ſweet exchange! O incomparable art! O benefits ſurmounting all expectation, that the iniquitie of many ſhould bee hidden in one righteous man, and that the righteouſneſſe of one, ſhould make many to be reputed righteous!*

In this the truth is ſo ſtrong, that *Bellarmine*, after hee had tryed all wayes, at the laſt yeelded vnto vs; for behold his wordes in the 7. Chapter and 2. booke of Iuſtification: *If the heretickes would onely haue that the merits of Ieſus Chriſt ſhould be imputed vnto vs becauſe they are giuen vnto vs, and wee may offer them to God the Father for our ſins, becauſe Chriſt hath taken on him the burthen to ſatisfie for vs, and to reconcile vs to God his Father, their opinion ſhould be true and right.* We ſay no other

other thing, and this ſimply is our beleefe. And in the tenth Chapter, after he hath ſaid that Chriſt is our righteouſneſſe, becauſe he hath ſatisfied for vs, he addeth; *In this manner it ſhould not be an abſurditie, if any man ſhould ſay, that the righteouſneſſe and the merits of Chriſt are imputed vnto vs, becauſe they are giuen and applyed vnto vs, as if we our ſelues had ſatisfied vnto God.* Then let vs hold there; for we ſay nothing more. By this meanes God ſhall not be deceiued, as M. *Arnoux* ſaith; and our righteouſneſſe ſhall be much more aſſured then if it were grounded vpon our owne wórkes: and yet God will not leaue to regenerate and ſanctifie vs inwardly, and frame vs to good workes. As God was not deceiued, when he imputed our ſinnes to Ieſus Chriſt, ſo he is not deceiued, when he imputeth the righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt vnto vs. There is neither iniuſtice nor ignorance committed, to deliuer a priſoner that lieth in priſon for debt, when another man hath payed it for him. For, as the ſinne of *Adam* was imputed to his poſterity, becauſe he repreſented all humane kind, as the beginning of them; ſo the righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt is imputed to all the faithfull, becauſe that by accompliſhing all righteouſneſſe, he repreſented all the Church, as the beginning thereof. And the righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt is imputed vnto the faithfull by greater reaſon then the ſinne of *Adam* is imputed vnto other men; becauſe *Adam* did not vndertake for others to obey God, but Ieſus Chriſt voluntarily ſubiected himſelfe to the Law, to deliuer vs from the curſe of the Law. Galat. 3. 13. and cap. 4. 4, 5

ARNOVX.

Places quoted in the margent of the Confeſſion: 1. Pet. 2. 24. 34. *Seſſ.* *Who his owne ſelfe bare our ſinnes in his body on the tree, that wee being dead to ſinne, ſhould liue in righteouſneſſe: by whoſe ſtripes ye were healed; And in the verſes following. For yee were as ſheepe going aſtray, but are now returned vnto the Shepheard and Biſhop of your ſoules.*

Theſe places are ſo farre from confirming that for the which they are alledged, that they rather ouerthrow it: ſeeing the Apoſtle

poſtle ſaith, That wee are by Ieſus Chriſts meanes, dead to ſinne, healed of ſin, converted from ſinne. Could he cleerelier ſay, that ſin liueth no more in vs, that the mortall diſeaſe thereof is no more in vs, and that we no more go aſtray? And can a man from thence conclude the contrary, that we are holden and reputed to be righteous, although in effect we are not?

This place of Saint *Peter* is not imployed in our Confeſſion to that ſence, or to that end which this Doctor imagineth. Our Confeſſion ſaith, that by the onely ſacrifice which Ieſus Chriſt offered vpon the croſſe, we are reconciled to God. For proofe thereof, the firſt Epiſtle and the ſecond Chapter and twenty fourth verſe of Saint *Peter* is quoted in the margent; *Chriſt bare our ſinnes in his body on the tree, that wee being dead to ſinne, ſhould liue in righteouſneſſe: by whoſe ſtripes ye were healed.* Can there be a ſtronger, or a more expreſſe place alledged, to proue that Ieſus Chriſt by his death vpon the croſſe hath reconciled vs vnto God? for that is the bearing of our ſinnes in his body on the tree, and to heale vs. But it pleaſeth M. *Arnoux* to make this place ſerue to another end, contrary to our meaning.

And yet this place prooues not that we are already wholly dead to ſinne, nor that we are exempted from ſinne. S. *Peter* ſpeaketh of the benefits which the death of Ieſus Chriſt bringeth vnto vs; but of theſe benefits there are ſome whereunto we cannot attaine but by degrees, and whereof the perfect accompliſhmēt ſhall not be performed but in the Kingdome of heauen. But M. *Arnoux* will perſwade vs, that hee is abſolutely righteous, and that ſinne liueth no more in him: and yet neuertheleſſe, hee goes to the Iubile to get pardons, and when he is confeſſed, he receiueth abſolution: when he ſaith his *Pater noſter*, hee ſaith, *Forgiue vs our treſpaſſes*; he beleeueth to goe to Purgatory, and makes profeſſion to doubt of his ſaluation. And if with the reſt of the Ieſuites, hee approueth and alloweth of Equiuocations in matter or trials of Iuſtice; of the rebellion of ſubiects againſt their King, and

of

of the ſecret of confeſſion, by the which a Prieſt ſhall haue knowledge of an enterpriſe againſt the life of a King: I can not ſee how that agreeth with a perfect righteouſneſſe.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places, Rom.5.5. The loue of God is ſhed abroad in our hearts by the holy Ghoſt, which is giuen vnto vs. Weigh theſe words (Shed abroad in our hearts.) Then it is not imputed without other effect. 35. Sect.

MOVLIN.

To whom ſpeakes he? The Apoſtle ſaith, and we alſo with him, that the loue wherewith God loueth vs, *is ſhed abroad in our hearts by the holy Ghoſt.* What is that to the purpoſe touching the righteouſneſſe of Ieſus Chriſt, and of his imputation? And againe, did we euer ſay, that this imputation is without any other effect?

ARNOVX.

Eph.4.23,24. And be renewed in the ſpirit of your minde, and put on the new man, which after God is created vnto righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe. 36. Sect.

It is an errour to beleeue, that by the new man he vnderſtandeth Ieſus Chriſt, ſeeing that Ieſus Chriſt was neuer the old man, and that Saint Paul alwaies attributeth to one and the ſame ſubiect, to be the old man, or the man of ſinne, and the new man, or renewed by the grace of Ieſus Chriſt; as old, he is a member of the firſt Adam; as new, of the ſecond: he deſcendeth from the firſt by naturall generation, which tranſferreth ſinne vnto him; and deſcendeth from the ſecond by the ſecond birth, which maketh him a child of God by the fountaine of grace.

MOVLIN.

This in no ſort toucheth or concerneth the imputation of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt. I thinke Mr. *Arnoux* thought vpon ſome other thing, or that ſome other body hath thruſt this allegation into his booke without his knowledge. What makes

makes this to our queſtion, whether Ieſus Chriſt is called or not called, The new man?

ARNOVX.

27. Sect. *Adde Romans 5.19. For as by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of One, many alſo ſhall bee made righteous.*

And then as it is true that we are ſinners by Adam, and not onely reputed ſo; euen ſo are we righteous by Ieſus Chriſt, and not onely accounted ſo.

MOVLIN.

All that is true: for by Ieſus Chriſt the children of God are truly made righteous in two ſorts: firſt, becauſe they are truly abſolued and iuſtified before the Iudgement ſeate of God. Secondly, becauſe the Spirit of Ieſus Chriſt working in the, truly regenerateth them. But this regeneration is done by degrees, it beginneth here on earth, and is perfected in heauen.

ARNOVX.

28. Sect. *The ſame article lower. VVe profeſſe that Ieſus Chriſt is our entire and perfect cleanſing or waſhing, and that in his death we haue entire ſatisfaction, to diſcharge vs of our offences and iniquities whereof we are culpable.*

Theſe faire words are ſet downe to aboliſh all fit or proper ſatisfaction, to draw the ſpirit of penitencie out of a mans heart, to quench the deſire to endure or ſuffer any thing for the loue of God whom we haue offended, to drowne the ſoule in the bog of negligence and careleſneſſe of good workes: and to be ſhort, to aſſure the wickedeſt man that is, of the righteouſneſſe of the Sonne of God, and of eſcaping the rigour of his Father in his perſon, without binding the ſinner to puniſh his ſinnes in himſelfe with a good will.

Of humane Satisfaction.

MOVLIN.

Our Confeſſion ſaith, that Ieſus Chriſt is the onely purgation

of

of our ſinnes, and that his death is a full and perfect ſatisfaction for the ſame: which we ground vpon the word of God, which ſaith, Apocalips 1. 5. That *Ieſus Chriſt hath waſhed vs from our ſinnes in his owne bloud.* 1. Ioh. 1. 7. *The bloud of Ieſus Chriſt cleanſeth vs from all ſinne.* Coloſ. 2. 13. *By him God freely forgiueth all our treſpaſſes.* Acts 4. 12. *There is no other name vnder heauen whereby we muſt be ſaued.* Coloſ. 1. 19, 20. *For it pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould all fulneſſe dwell, and hauing made peace through the bloud of the croſſe, by him to reconcile all things vnto himſelfe both which are in earth, & which are in heauen* 1. Ioh. 2. 2. *He is the reconciliation for our ſins, and not for ours onely, but alſo for the ſinnes of the whole world.* Heb. 10. 14. *For by one offering he hath conſecrated for euer them that are ſanctified.* Heb. 7. 25. *He is able alſo perfectly to ſaue them that come vnto God by him.* Rom. 3. 24. *We are iuſtified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Ieſus Chriſt.* And to conclude, it is the whole ſcope of the Goſpell.

This ſo holy, ſo euident, and ſo true a doctrine, full of conſolation, diſpleaſeth *M. Arnoux*: he ſaith it aboliſheth our ſatisfactions, quencheth the ſpirit of penitence, and drowneth our ſoules in the gulph of preſumption.

Touching mens ſatisfactions, we ſay briefly, that if the word *Satisfaction* were taken in that ſence which the ancient Fathers took it, that is, for humiliation and aeknowledgement of our faults, there ſhould be no diſputation betweene vs. But at this day, ſatisfaction ſignifieth a payment of debts, and a recompence which man maketh to God to ſatisfie his iuſtice. The Catechiſme of the Councell of Trent ſaith, that *Satisfaction is an entire payment of that thing which is due, and a recompence which man maketh vnto God for his ſinnes*: as when a man puniſheth himſelfe (as *M. Arnoux* ſaith) by faſting, whipping, pilgrimages and giuing ſomething to the Church, and when God torments him in Purgatory. Cardinall *Bellarmines* words are remarkeable vpon this point, in the firſt booke of Indulgences, Chap. 4. *If a righteous man* (ſaith he) *by his workes may by equiualence merit life euerlaſting, why can he not ſatisfie for temporall paine, which is*

Cap. de Sacramento penitentiæ. Satisfactio eſt rei debitæ integra ſolutio: Eſt compenſatio, cum homo pro peccatis commiſſis Deo aliquid perſoluit.

a.

a diſcharge? And in the ſecond Chapter of the ſame booke he ſaith, *The remiſſion of the paine is due to the ſatisfying worke, by commutatiue iuſtice:* which is a iuſtice that payeth ſo much for ſo much, or a bartering iuſtice, in ſuch manner that God ought to be content therewith. By this reckoning, God ſhould doe contrary to iuſtice, if he ſhould not accept for good payment, the ſatisfying paines wherewith a ſinner puniſheth himſelfe. And in the 10. Chap. of the firſt booke of Purgatory; *It ſeemeth* (ſaith he) *more probable, that in effect there is but one ſatisfaction, which is ours.* Touching that of Ieſus Chriſt, he will haue it to ſerue onely to make ours auaileable. Nay the pride of the Romane Church is ſo great, that in it they hold that a man can make more ſatisfaction vnto God then he ought to do, ſo that there is ſomething remaining to be allowed to the ſinner ouer and aboue: that is it which they call ſuperabundant ſatisfaction, which is the monaſticall life.

1 As for vs, ſeeing that in Ieſus Chriſt we haue a full ſatisfaction for all our ſinnes, we are content therewith, and take not vpon vs by our own ſufferings to pay a debt which Ieſus Chriſt hath wholly ſatisfied.

2 Alſo we doe not beleeue that Ieſus Chriſt died to make our ſufferings of any worth before God, but to free and exempt vs from ſuffering. For the benefit of Ieſus Chriſts ſuffering conſiſteth not herein, to make vs pay, but to pay and ſatisfie for vs vnto God. Saint *Paul* in the 1. to Tim. 2. 6. ſaith, that *Ieſus Chriſt gaue himſelfe a ranſome for vs.* But hee ſaith not, that he gaue vs the vertue to pay our own ranſome. And the Apoſtle, Heb. 1. 4. ſaith, that *The Sonne of God hath by himſelfe purged our ſinnes.* Then not by our ſatisfactions.

3 That if it be an honour which God doth vnto vs, by our ſufferings to make our owne ſatisfaction, (as the Papiſts alledge) & that if our ſatisfying paines and puniſhments are reckoned among the graces of God, the diuels and the damned ſhall haue more part in thoſe graces then wee; ſeeing God doth them that honour, to make them to pay by continuall torments, and draweth full ſatisfaction from them.

4 God forbid that wee ſhould beleeue, that God take pay-

payment twice for one debt, when the first payment is ſufficient. Will God that is ſoueraignly iuſt, after he hath pardoned all our offences, puniſh thoſe ſinnes that he hath pardoned with ſatisfying paines?

5. And ſeeing that the Church of Rome beleeueth, that by the death of Ieſus Chriſt all our guiltineſſe is taken away, will God puniſh men without fault in a burning fire? The cauſe which onely produceth an effect being taken away, by neceſſity the effect ceaſeth. Now the fault is the cauſe which onely produceth the ſatisfying puniſhment. Therefore the fault being taken away, neceſſarily ſatisfying puniſhment is taken away: as *Tertullian* ſaith in his booke of Baptiſme, cap. 5. *The fault being taken away, the paine alſo is taken away.* *Exemptorea. tu, remittitur & pœna.*

6. Beſides, God is no mocker: but he ſhould manifeſtly mocke vs, if he ſhould ſay, I will forgiue thee, but yet I will puniſh thee. I forgiue thee thy debt, but thou ſhalt pay me. For our ſinnes are debts, the payment whereof is the puniſhment.

7. It is not credible that God would haue vs to be more mercifull then himſelfe. But he will haue vs wholly forgiue him that hath offended vs: he permitteth not vs to take any vengeance or reuenge after we haue forgiuen him. For what is forgiueneſſe but not to puniſh? Then if God forgiueth the ſinne, and not the puniſhment of the ſinne, the way is made open to fraudulent reconciliations: and he that ſhall haue pardoned an iniury, wil in his heart reſerue a puniſhment for the ſame. For he will ſay: Will you haue me more mercifull then God? Herein I haue followed his example. We are too much inclined to vice, without ſeeking to proue that God encites vs thereunto by his example.

8 I would haue them to ſhew me, how and in what manner Ieſus Chriſt bore our offences: was it not by ſuffering the puniſhment due to them? And if he endured the puniſhment, was it not to exempt vs from it? This is it which S. *Auguſtine* ſaith in his 27 Sermon of the words of the Lord. *Chriſt taking vpon him the puniſhment and not the fault, hath aboliſhed both* *Suſcipiendo pœnam, & non ſuſcipiendo culpam, & culpam deleuit & pœnam.*

the fault and the punishment.

9 It appeareth also how fooliſh this doctrine is, that the fault ſhould be remitted and not the puniſhment, by this, that there is no criminall perſon but would be very well content that the king ſhould not pardon his offence, ſo that he would wholly remit the paine and puniſhment thereof, and not ſuffer him to endure any puniſhment at all.

10 If by our owne ſuffering we muſt ſatisfie and appeaſe the wrath of God, when ſhall we haue ſatisfied for the leaſt part of our ſinnes? ſeeing that by the iudgement of the Sonne of God, Mat. 5. 12. to call our brother foole, is a fault puniſhable with hell fire: and that S. *Paul* 1. Cor. 6. ſaith, that *euill ſpeakers ſhall not inherite the kingdome of God.* And yet theſe are ſinnes from which the moſt righteous men can hardly cleare themſelues.

11 Adde hereunto, that by this doctrine the afflictions of the faithfull are bitter, and their finger is dipt in gall. For the faithful which beleeueth that God puniſheth him for his good, and that it is a great puniſhment not to be chaſtiſed, is eaſly cõforted in his afflictions, the which he receiueth as ſpirituall remedies. The maladies of the body are vnto him medicines of the ſoule. Pouerty to him is a diet, and a diſcipline of abſtinence. Baniſhment an abandoning of the world, and an admonition that he is a ſtranger vpon earth. And if they be afflictions for the Goſpel, he glorieth therein, as in honorable wounds and badges of our warfare, and conformities to the croſſe of Chriſt. But where ſhall the faithfull find cõfort and conſolation in their euils, if they muſt beleeue that God puniſheth them to ſatisfie his iuſtice? and that their ſufferings are ſatisfactions vnto him? Therein they haue no other conſolation then Pagans haue, which is, to giue place to neceſſitie, and to arme themſelues with hardneſſe againſt blowes, with a kind of patience without comfort.

12 Then when theſe ſatisfactions ſhall be well weighed, they will be found very light: & it will appeare, that the Papiſts would pay the iuſtice of God with baſe money; whoſe ſatisfactions are, to abſtaine from fleſh certaine dayes, to go

go on pilgrimage, & ſo to leade an idle life; to gird their bodies with cords, to enter into the Order of any Friers, to whip themſelues openly, as the penitents in Rome vſe to do in the weeke before Eaſter; ſome for their owne ſinnes, others being hired, whipping themſelues for other mens ſinnes: ſome alſo for loue, and to ſatisfie God for the ſinnes of their miſtreſſes. Thus you ſee wherewith they would haue God ſatisfied and contented for their ſinnes, for they eſteeme it to be an eaſie compoſition. To ioyne theſe things with the infinite ſatisfactions of the Sonne of God, is as if one ſhould ſew beggers rags to a kings robe.

13 Certainly theſe people with their penall workes, whippings, and voluntary torments, ſeeme to me to ſpeake vnto God, and to ſay, I will ſatisfie thee. Thou wilt wholly remit my ſinne, but I wil not be ſo much beholden vnto thee. It is great reaſon then that they ſhould pay to the full. And if thereupon by a fantaſticall penitence, or by a proud humility they cut and mangle their fleſh, I trow they haue well deſerued it. And ſeeing that to ſatisfie God they are obſtinately bent to be burnt after this life in ſo long and burning a fier, it is reaſon that they ſhould ſoake in fier, and that the ſentence of Chriſt which they alledge vnto vs, ſhould be practiſed vpon themſelues, Math. 5. 26. *Verily I ſay vnto thee, thou ſhalt not come out thence, till thou haſt payde the vtter moſt farthing.*

14 But at the day of Iudgement, when they muſt yeeld an account of their actions, and that their ſinnes ſhall be layed open before them, what ſhall be their excuſe? They will ſay, *Lord, it is true, I haue committed ſuch and ſuch ſinnes, but I haue ſatisfied for them; for I haue whipt my ſelfe, I haue abſtained from eating of fleſh for ſo many dayes, I went on pilgrimage, I was one of the order of gray friers.* But here I am afraid that things being put into the ballance of Gods Iuſtice, they will be found too light by many graines, and that the ſame which they giue for ſatisfaction, would rather be found to be a ſin; ſeeing they are things which God neuer required at their hands. I am afraid that theſe ſatisfiers will be found culpable, not onely for ſeeking to pay God with falſe money, but

also finding out another satisfaction then that of the Sonne,
Math. 17.5. in whome the Father is well pleased, and whose bloud cleanseth
1 Iohn 1.7. vs from all our sinnes.

15 But among the satisfying paines, there is one kind that to me seemes to be full of impiety. The Church of Rome placeth prayers and almes among penall workes & satisfying paines. What a religion is this, that placeth good workes among sufferings for sinnes? which on the contrarie, if they should be prohibited to a man fearing God, it would be an vnsufferable punishment vnto him. They intend then that men must serue God by punishment. By this meanes good workes are made odious, and the exercise of piety becomes a punishment. Neuertheleſſe they haue some reason to put prayers (such as they make) among penances; for, to be condemned to repeate one prayer fifty times one after the other, in an vnknowne language, and euery day to say his seuen Psalmes of mercy, without vnderstanding them, byting their fingers because of the tediousnesse therof, mee thinkes it is a great punishment.

16 Superstitious ignorance hauing sowne the seeds of this abuse, the anarice & ambition of Priests hath nourished them: for there is nothing but they will do it for gaine. Who being very sensible in the belly, are much moued when men touch their profits, and seeke to shorten their commons. For these satisfactions are very fruitfull vnto them, seeing that purgatory is so beneficiall vnto thē, & that by the satisfaction which Priests impose vpon men, they take authority to inflict corporall punishments vpon sinners, which by the order of the Romane Church may be changed into pecuniarie punishments. And that by the same meanes, the Popes haue bene so bold to punish kings, & make them to endure blows with a whip; as *Alexander* the third did to *Henry* the second King of England, and as of late *Clement* the eight did to our great King *Henry* the fourth in the person of the Bishop of Eureux his Embassador; to whom falling down at his feete, the Pope caused certaine blowes with a whip to be giuen for a satisfaction. Pope *Innocent* the third imposed vpon *Iohn* King

of

of England for ſatisfaction, that he ſhould reſigne his kingdome vnto him, and make his Crowne and Realme tributary to the Pope.

17 Ieſus Chriſt did not ſo, for in the eighth of Saint Iohn, hauing pardoned the woman taken in adultery, he impoſed no ſatisfying paine vnto her, but onely ſaid vnto her, *Go and ſinne no more.* The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* in 2. Cor. 2. ſaith, that he had pardoned the inceſtuous perſon, to whom neuertheleſſe he enioyned no penance after the pardon.

18 If theſe ſatisfactions be euill, why do they enioyne them? if they be good, why do they diſpence with them by Indulgences? why do they hinder the ſinner from making ſatisfaction vnto God?

The abuſe being thus diſcouered, they runne for aide, and ſeeke to ſupport their ruinous cauſe with reeds.

1 They alledge the counſell that Daniel, 4. 27. gaue to *Nebuchadnezzar, Redeeme thy ſinnes by righteouſneſſe, and thine iniquities by ſhewing mercy to the poore.* But they are deceiued to thinke that *Daniel* ſpeaketh of redeeming in reſpect of God: for he ſpeaketh of redeeming & ſatisfying before men, whom the king had wronged, whom he ought to recompence by liberality. Adde hereunto that almes are good workes, and not puniſhmẽts nor penances. And which is more, our aduerſaries will haue almes and other ſatisfactions not to ſatisfie for ſinnes, but for the puniſhments due to ſinnes. The chiefe point is, that the Church of Rome holdeth that ſatisfactions ſerue onely to ſatisfie for the temporall puniſhment, and not for the eternall: and that they ſerue for nothing before baptiſme, no more then they did in time paſt before circumciſion. Now this king was a pagan vncircumcized, and ought rather to thinke vpon ſauing himſelfe from eternall paines: for the ſatisfactions of Purgatory are of no value nor worth vnto them that go into hell: and to go about to ſatisfie for temporall puniſhment, when a man is bound to eternall puniſhment, is all one as to ſet vp a weathercocke before the foundation be layed.

Reaſons wherewith our aduerſaries vſe to ſupport their ſatisfactions.

2 Alſo they ſay, that the benefit of Ieſus Chriſt ought to be

applied vnto vs, and that it is applied vnto vs by ſatisfactory puniſhment, and by the torments of Purgatory. Whereunto I anſwer, that they ſay this without proofe, and without teſtimony of the holy Scriptures. It belongs to the word of God to preſcribe vs the meanes to applie vnto our ſelues the benefit of our Redeemer, and not to vs to gueſſe at it. Adde hereunto, that none can apply any thing by his contrary, as theſe Doctors do, that will haue God to apply the remiſſion of our debts by making vs pay them, and the pardon in Ieſus Chriſt by the puniſhment; as if a man ſhould apply a medicine by poyſon. Certainely, to apply the grace of God to a man by roſting him in a fire, is a ſtrange kinde of application. The benefits of our Sauiour are applied vnto vs by faith, Eph. 3. 17. By Baptiſme, Galat. 3. 27. By the holy Supper of our Lord, 1. Cor. 10. 18. but not with blowes with a whip, waſting of the ſpirits by a haire-cloth, or by a Monks coule.

3 They adde, that in all the workes of God, his Iuſtice as well as his Mercie muſt appeare; but Saint Iames, 2. 13. contradicteth that, ſaying, *There ſhall be condemnation mercyleſſe to him that ſheweth not mercy.* Then let vs ſay the like, that *there ſhall be mercie without iudgement to him that ſhall ſhew mercy.* And as Saint *Paul* ſaith, Rom. 8. 1: *There is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Ieſus.* If none, then neither eternall nor temporall. And yet the Iuſtice of God hath euidently beene diſplayed againſt the ſinnes of the children of God, by puniſhing them in Ieſus Chriſt, who bare the puniſhment; and his mercy ſhewed by freely imputing that ſatisfaction vnto vs.

4 They alſo ſay, that after the King hath pardoned an offender, yet the partie offended is to be agreed withall. I anſwer, that, That falls out ſo, becauſe the King and the partie are two; but here God which is the King, is alſo the party: who hauing remitted all that belongs to him, there is no more parties to content.

5 Their reaſon is no better, when they ſay that the King hauing granted an offender his life, neuertheleſſe condemnes him to pay a great fine. For in that caſe (ſay they) the pardon which

which the King giueth, is not a full pardon, but a diminishing of the punishment. But Gods pardon is full and entire, Colos. 2. 13. *God freely forgiueth all our offences.* And 1. Iohn 1. 7. *The blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne.* χαρισαμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα.

6 They also bring in experience for a proofe: for they say, that after God hath pardoned vs, he ceaseth not to punish vs. So *Dauid* was punished by God after he had declared vnto him by the Prophet *Nathan*, that he had forgiuen his offence, 2. Sam. 12. 13. And from thence Cardinall *Bellarmine* in the tenth chapter of his first booke of Purgatorie inferreth, That Iesus Christ hath not fully satisfied for all the punishments of our sinnes. * *If Christ* (saith he) *hath satisfied for all our faults, and for all our punishments, why doe wee yet suffer so many euils after the fault is remitted?* This Prelate wrongs the Sonne of God, denying that his death is our full payment. But to answere to this obiection, I say it is nothing to that purpose, for the question is of satisfactory punishments: but the punishments suffered by *Dauid* were chastisements; the one are punishments of a Iudge, the other the corrections of a father. The one serueth to make satisfaction to him that is offended, and to the iustice of the Iudge; the other to correct our vnrighteousnesse, and to amend a sinner. The chastisements wherewith God visiteth his children are benefits and spirituall medicines: they are exercises and not payments. Medicines are not satisfactions. A good father correcteth his children to make them better, and not to content himselfe and to satisfie his iustice. If our Aduersaries would beleeue with vs, that God punisheth not his children, but with punishments of amendment & fatherly chastisements, Purgatorie would soone fall, where amendment hath no place. For they will haue Purgatorie to be a vengeance which God taketh for faults past, and not a warning for the time to come. The death of Iesus Christ serueth to exempt vs from satisfying the iustice of God by satisfactorie punishments, but not to exempt vs from chastisements. For it ought not to serue to hurt vs, and to make vs incorrigible; but those whom God hath adopted in Iesus

* *Si Christus satisfecit pro omni culpa & pœna nostra, cur post remissam culpam adhuc, tam multa mala patimur?*

Christ, are those whom he chastiseth most carefully for their instruction. So he chastened *David*, who in supporting these fatherly corrections, neuer thought by that meanes to satisfie the iustice of God.

7 *Master Arnoux*, to make vs odious, saith, that by abolishing our owne satisfactions and merits, *we pull the spirit of penitence out of our hearts, and drowne the soule in the bog of slothfulnesse and negligence of good workes, &c.* On the contrary, I maintaine, that there is nothing which more stirreth vp and wakeneth repentance, nor that inciteth a man more to feare God and loue him, then the memory of our free redemption by Iesus Christ, and of our full reconciliation. The true motiue vnto piety, is not the ambition of merits, or of praying God with our owne, nor the feare of a fire after this life, but a filiall loue, kindled by the acknowledging of his loue. He that serueth God only for feare of punishment, is moued thereunto by a seruile feare, and not by a filiall loue. God sheweth great clemency vnto such a man, if he punisheth him not for his seruice. Therefore, the Scripture that speaketh of free pardon, and of redemption in Iesus Christ, ordinarily from thence draweth exhortations to feare God, and to liue holily. *David*, in the hundred & thirtieth Psalme, verse the fourth, saith, *But there is forgiuenesse with thee, that thou mayest be feared.* And Saint *Paul*, Rom. 12. 1. exhorteth vs by the mercies of God to offer and consecrate our bodies vnto the Lord. For (saith he) in another place: *The grace of God that brings salvation vnto all men, hath appeared, and teacheth vs, that we should deny vngodlinesse and worldly lusts, and that we should liue soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.* Iesus Christ hath redeemed vs, to the end that wee should serue him: his fauour is not a prophane impunitie: Christian liberty is not a licence: peace of conscience is not a carnall sluggishnesse. The Apostle saith, Iesus Christ cannot be diuided: but it is a diuiding of him, if we will haue him for a Redeemer and not for a Master, to participate in his promises, in reiecting his commandements, 1 Peter 2. 24. *He hath borne our sins in his body on the tree, that we being dead to sin, should*

Tit. 2. 11, 12.

2 Cor. 1. 13.

should line vnto righteousnesse.

We see not any where, but in the Romish Church where humane satisfactions are preached, that by that meanes vice is diminished; for the church of Rome is the onely church in the world, where vice is become a law, and where by publike ordinances, the Stewes are erected, whoredome permitted, and marriage forbidden. There is none but the Romish church, wherein by lawes and decrees, the people are taught to be rebels to their Prince, and not to keepe faith with those that are excommunicated, and where a traffioke of sacred things is publikely established.

8 All this abuse is grounded vpon a most pernicious maxime, which is one of the cankered vlcers of the church of Rome. This maxime is, that the punishment for sinne before Baptisme, is remitted vnto vs by Baptisme; but that for the punishment of sinnes committed after Baptisme, wee are to satisfie for them by penall workes, and satisfactory penance, aswell in this life as in Purgatory. A new Gospell, whereof there is not found one print or tract in all the Word of God. The Councel of Trent, in the fourteenth Session, eighth chapter, to defend this doctrine, saith, That it seemes that the iustice of God requireth, that those that before Baptisme haue sinned by ignorance, should be more fauourably vsed then those that haue sinned voluntarily after Baptisme. But these Fathers by saying so, condemne themselues. For, may it not fall out, that some may sinne maliciously before Baptisme: and on the contrary, that after Baptisme they may sinne by ignorance or infirmity? In this case, what apparence is there, that God will not exact any satisfactory punishment for sins committed of deliberate malice, and will exact them for sins cómitted by ignorance or of infirmity? And which is more, may it not happen, that a man should cause himselfe fainedly or for gaine to be baptized, and yet in his heart is an enemy to the Name of Christ? Is it a iust thing, that hypocrisie should be auaileable vnto him, and that for mocking of God, all his sinnes committed before Baptisme should be pardoned, without any penance or satisfaction?

To

To conclude, *the blond of Ieſus Chriſt cleanſeth all our ſinnes*, 1. Iohn 1. 7. Then as well ſinnes before baptiſme, as ſinnes after baptiſme. *By Ieſus Chriſt God pardoneth all our offences*, Coloſ. 2. 13. This word, *all*, alloweth no exception. Saint *Paul* to the Galat. chap. 3. 27. ſaith, *That all thoſe that are baptized haue put on Chriſt*. By this word *put on*, he ſheweth vs, that the fruite of baptiſme is ſpecially for the time after baptiſme, for we put on clothes for the time to come.

ARNOVX.

39. Sect. *Places of the Scripture noted in the margent of the Confeſſion. Hebrewes 9. 14. How much more ſhall the blond of Chriſt, which through the eternall Spirit offered himſelfe without fault to God, purge your conſciences from dead workes, to ſerue the liuing God?*

And 1 Peter 1. 18. 19. Knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, as ſiluer and gold, from your vaine conuerſation receiued by tradition from your Fathers: but with the precious blond of Chriſt.

In theſe two places there is not one word ſpoken of ſatisfaction, and the words of entire and perfect waſhing, vnder the which the venome is hidden, are not found therein: but here the Apoſtle aſcribeth to the merits of Chriſt, the vertue to purifie our conſciences, to deliuer them from dead workes, to make vs ſerue the liuing God, and to redeeme vs from our vaine conuerſation.

MOVLIN.

It is true, that in theſe places the word *Satisfaction* is not found, but the word *redeeme*, which is all one in effect; for our redemption by Ieſus Chriſt is a ſatisfaction for vs. He that redeemeth a priſoner, by that redemption ſatisfieth for him. The word *waſh* alſo is not there, but the word *cleanſe*, which is all one, and is found in other places, as in Apoc. 1. 6. Touching the perfection and integritie of this redemption and waſhing, we haue before produced a great number of places to proue it. That which *M. Arnoux* addeth, that the merite of the Sonne of God purifieth our conſciences, and deliuereth

To him that hath loued vs and waſhed vs from our ſinnes, &c.

liuereth them from dead works, &c. is true, but to what end ſerues that to eſtabliſh humane ſatisfaction?

Of ſuperabundant ſatisfactions, and whether the merite of Chriſt is applied vnto vs by our owne ſatisfactions.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture, Coloſſ. 1.24. Now reioyce I in my ſufferings for you, and fulfill the reſt of the afflictions of Chriſt in my fleſh, for his bodies ſake which is the Church. 40 Sect.

It is not becauſe the Sonne of God hath not abundantly ſatisfied, as touching the ſufficiency of his paines and dolours infinitely meritorious, and of the ſmalleſt drop of his blood that was ſhed, which is much more worth then a thouſand Worlds: but the Apoſtle teacheth vs, that if wee be not like Ieſus Chriſt, and doe not ſuffer with him, following his example, his rich treaſures of merits will ſerue vs for nothing, for want of being applyed by our proper ſatisfactions, all which are the true and firſt effects of his death, by the which hee hath merited grace for vs to doe them, following his example.

MOVLIN.

Our Aduerſaries ordinarily alledge this place out of the firſt chapter of the Coloſſians, to prooue that the Saints and Monkes make more ſatisfactions, and endure more paines then they need to ſatisfie for themſelues; whereupon they inferre that the ſame is meritorious for others. Therefore *Bellarmine*, in the fourth chapter and firſt booke of Indulgences, ſaith, that the Saints in ſome manner are our redeemers. Therfore alſo the Canon of the Maſſe requireth aide of God, not only by the praiers of Saints, but alſo by their merits. Which is a new Goſpell, and a meere prophanation of the doctrine of ſaluation, whereby they will haue God to receiue and accept the ſuperabundant ſtripes and faſtings of S. *Francis*, or of S. *Domi-*

Quorum precibus meritiſque vouamus &c.

Dominicke; in recompence for our ſinnes; as if a Iudge ſhould diſcharge and ſet a priſoner free, becauſe his brother was whipt for him. How can he haue any remnant or ſuperfluitie of merit, that hath need of pardon? How can he ſatiſfie for another, that cannot ſatisfie for himſelfe?

But *M. Arnoux* dares not ſtirre this filthy puddle, but contents himſelfe to alledge this place to ſupport humane ſatiſfactions, preſuppoſing that S *Paul* by his ſuffrings made ſatiſfaction vnto God: which is falſe, for in this place there is neyther trace nor foot-ſtep therof to be ſeene. It is true that S. *Paul* ſuffered for the Church, but not to make ſatisfaction for the Church, but to edifie and confirme the Church, as *Lombardus*, *Anſelmus*, and *Thomas* expound it in their Commentaries vpon this place, conformable to that which the ſaid Apoſtle ſaith to the Philippians, 1. 12. The reſt of the afflictions of Chriſt, which are not yet accompliſhed, are the afflictions of the Church, which Ieſus Chriſt ſaith are his, Acts 9. 4. *Saul, Saul* (ſaith he) *why perſecuteſt thou me?* And Matth. 25. 40. *In as much as ye haue done it vnto one of the leaſt of theſe my brethren, ye haue done it to me.* That which our Doctor ſaith, that we muſt ſuffer according to the example of Ieſus Chriſt, is true, but not thereby to ſatisfie Gods Iudgements, or to content his Iuſtice. It is to ſteepe the afflictions for Ieſus Chriſt into bitterneſſe, and to make them intolerable, if we make them payments, ſatisfactions, and penances to appeaſe and content the Iuſtice of God: whereas they are the liueries of Chriſtian ſouldiers, an honourable opprobrie, and a conformity to the Sonne of God. It is no glorie to be puniſhed: but it is an honour to fight after Ieſus Chriſt, and for Ieſus Chriſt.

Touching that which *M. Arnoux* ſaith, that the merits of our Sauiour muſt be applied vnto vs by our owne ſatisfactions, it is an inuention forged vpon the anuill of coueto-uſneſſe, and blowne with the bellowes of pride, without the word of God, to the which belongeth the authority to preſcribe the manner how to apply Ieſus Chriſt vnto vs, and not to vs to inuent the meanes. Behold, the meanes which it

giueth

giueth vs to apply Ieſus Chriſt vnto vs. Firſt by baptiſme, Galat. 3. 27. *For all ye that are baptized into Chriſt, haue put on Chriſt.* Secondly, by the holy Supper, 1. Cor. 10. 16. *The bread which we breake, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt?* Thirdly, by faith, Epheſ. 3. 12. *By whom we haue boldneſſe and entrance with confidence, by faith in him.* And this faith *is by hearing of the word of God*, Rom. 10. 17. But to apply Ieſus Chriſt vnto vs by ſuffering paines and torments in this life, or in Purgatory, the word of God ſpeaketh not at all. The reaſon is moſt manifeſt; for we do not apply a thing by the contrary thereof, as the Church of Rome doth, that will haue God to apply grace and pardon of ſinnes freely vnto vs by puniſhing vs: and that God applieth the remiſſion of our debts vnto vs, by making vs to pay them: that is not to apply, but to cut off and dry vp this grace. Is not this a notable application, to burne a man two or three thouſand yeeres in a fire? And yet to intoxicate our braines, they place this fire among the graces of God: they will haue the blood of Ieſus Chriſt to giue vertue to this fire to be a ſatisfaction. In the end we ſhal find by their doctrine, that the diuels are Gods minions: for God ſheweth them the fauour to ſatisfie to the full, and by that meanes they haue this aduantage, not to be much bound vnto him.

ARNOVX.

And Romans 12. 1. *I beſeech you therefore brethren, by the mercies of God, that you giue vp your bodies a liuing ſacrifice, holy acceptable vnto God, which is your reaſonable ſeruing of God.* 24. Sect.

MOVLIN.

I cannot conceiue how this place ſerueth for humane ſatisfactions. Saint *Paul* by this holy and pleaſing ſacrifice to God, vnderſtandeth our good workes, but not corporall or pecuniary puniſhments which make amends or ſacrifice for our ſinnes. Our good workes are ſacrifices of thankſgiuing, and not expiatory puniſhments, to recompence or ſatisfie the iuſtice of God.

THE

THE EIGHTEENTH ARTICLE.

We beleeue that all our righteousnes is grounded vpon the remission of our sinnes, as also our whole felicity, as *Dauid* saith. Therefore we reiect all other meanes to iustifie vs before God, and without presuming of any merits or vertues, we simply and wholly depend vpon the obedience of Iesus Christ, which is allowed vnto vs, as well to couer all our faults, as to make vs find grace and fauour before God. And to conclude, we beleeue, that declining, how little soeuer it be, from this foundation, we can find no rest nor comfort elsewhere, but rather are continually disquieted in mind, because we are neuer at peace with God, vntill such time as that wee are fully resolued that we are beloued in Iesus Christ, seeing that of our selues we are worthy to be hated.

THE NINETEENTH ARTICLE.

We beleeue that by this meanes we haue free liberty and priuiledge to call vpon God, with full assurance that he will shew himselfe to be our Father: For we shall haue no accesse vnto the Faaher, if we be not directed by this Mediatour, and that to be heard in his name, it behoueth vs to hold our liues of him, as of our head.

The aduersary saith nothing to these two points, as finding nothing therein worthy reprehension.

THE

THE TWENTIETH ARTICLE.

Of Iuſtification by faith, and what true faith is.

We beleeue that we are made partakers of this righteouſnes onely by faith, as it is ſaid that he ſuffered to obtaine ſaluation for vs, to the end that whoſoeuer ſhall beleeue in him, ſhall not periſh: and that the ſame is done, for as much as the promiſes of life which are made vnto vs in him, are appropriated to our vſe, and we feele the effect thereof when we accept them, not doubting, that being aſſured by the mouth of God, we ſhall not be fruſtrated thereof. So the iuſtice which we obtaine by faith, dependeth vpon free promiſes, by the which God ſignifieth and declareth vnto vs, that he loueth vs.

ARNOVX.

Herein they ſtill contend and ſtriue againſt charity, and the exerciſes of vertues, vnder the name of faith, to fill the ſoule with a vaine preſumption which hath no ground in the Scripture, and conſiſteth (according to their opinion) in firmely beleeuing and truſting without any doubt, that they are as well aſſured of the kingdome of heauen as Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe. So Caluin teacheth in the fourth booke of his Inſtitutions, cap. 17. ſect. 2. ſaying, In the Catholicke Church we truly hold, that without true faith we cannot pleaſe God, nor be righteous; and that faith is the roote of the tree, and the foundation of the houſe. But if it be not working by charity, it is an houſe without roofe, and a tree without fruite: and neither the one nor the other are ſeruiceable to the maſter. 42. Sect.

What faith is, and what it can be without hope, and without knowledge.

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

He ſpeaketh of vs as of enemies vnto charitie and all vertue, and as if we contented our ſelues to beleeue, and to haue a faith without workes, and by conſequence dead and vnprofitable. Cardinall *Bellarmine* purgeth vs of this ſlander in the third booke and ſixt Chapter of Iuſtification. *The aduerſaries* (ſaith he) *do not deny, but that faith and repentance are requiſite, that is, a liuely faith, and an earneſt repentance: and that without them no man can be iuſtified.* Whoſoeuer is an enemy to charity; whoſoeuer ſaith that good workes are not neceſſary to ſaluation: and whoſoeuer thinketh to be ſaued by a faith without workes, let him be accurſed. In the meane time, this accuſation made againſt vs, is very vnſeemely in the mouth of the Church of Rome, wherein vices are in the laſt degree or ranck, ſpecially in Rome, from whence, with the deciſions of faith, come examples of vices without example.

[a] *Si quis dixerit fidem iuſtificantem nihil aliud eſſe quã fiduciam diuinæ miſericordiæ peccata remittentis propter Chriſtum, Anathema ſit.*

The originall of this abuſe proceedeth from this, that our aduerſaries know not what this word *faith* in the Scripture ſignifieth: and point & ſet forth vnto vs a falſe imagination for the true faith; for if they could diſcerne and perceiue what faith is, they would behold it neceſſary accompanied with vertue, and fruitfull in good workes.

[b] *Probatur fidem iuſtificantem non eſſe fiduciam miſericordiæ Dei, ſed ſolum aſſenſum firmum ac certum, ad ea omnia quæ Deus credenda proponit.*

The Councell of [a] Trent in the tenth Canon of the ſixt Seſſion, pronounceth a curſe vnto thoſe that ſay, that *iuſtifying faith is no other thing but hope in the mercie of God, that pardoneth our ſinnes in Ieſus Chriſt.* And *Bellarmine* in the firſt booke and fift chapter of Iuſtification [b] ſaith, *that iuſtifying faith is not a hope that God will be mercifull vnto vs; but onely a firme conſenting vnto all that which God will haue to be beleeued.* Touching the affiance whereby ſome men particularly perſwade themſelues that God wil be mercifull vnto them, he ſaith at the end of the chapter, [c] that it is rather a preſumption. And to make an end of painting out of faith, he bereaueth it of knowledge: and in the ſeuenth chapter maintaineth: [d] that *faith is not a knowledge, but a conſenting*; and that, *Fides melius per ignorantiam quàm per*

[c] *Catholici certam promiſſionem ſpecialis miſericordiæ, non tam ad fidem quàm ad præſumptionem pertinere contendunt.*

[d] *Probatur fidem non eſſe notitiam ſed aſſenſum.*

notitiam

notitiam definitur: That faith is better defined by ignorance then by knowledge. For the Church of Rome will haue the people to beleeue without knowledge, and to referre themselues therein to the Church, without knowing what the Church beleeueth, or what it ought to beleeue.

This is the ground of the mischiefe. For seeing that our aduersaries by *faith*, vnderstand a consenting to an vnknowne doctrine, which onely beleeueth that all that which God hath said, is true; without knowing what it is, and without confidence in his promise, it is no maruell that they seeke for their iustification in another thing, and not in faith: and that *M. Arnoux* thinketh, that to extoll faith, is to fight against charity and the exercise of vertues. For there is nothing found in faith (as the Church of Rome defineth it) which may not be found in diuers prophane persons, yea euen in the diuels themselues, who beleeue that all that which God hath said is true, and consent thereunto: for faith without knowledge is a voluntary blindnesse vnder shaddow of docility. To know the promise of God, and not to beleeue it, is an iniury done vnto God, and matter of torment and disquietnesse of conscience.

The Word of God describeth faith vnto vs in a contrarie manner. For Iesus Christ not onely saith, *Beleeue me*, but *Beleeue in me*, Iohn 14. 1. Now to beleeue in Iesus Christ, is to put our trust in him. And in Rom. 4. 19. *Abrahams* faith is described by this, that he made no doubt of the promise of God with distrust, but was strengthened in faith. And *Abraham* is called the father of the faithfull: that his faith may be an example to conforme vs thereunto. Saint *Iames* 1. 6. will haue *the faithfull pray in faith, and wauer not*: for that faith in prayer excludeth doubt and distrust to be heard. And in Matth. 8. 26. When the disciples were afraid to be drowned, although Iesus Christ was with them in the ship, he rebuked them saying, *Why are ye fearefull, O ye of little faith?* Here there was no question made of consenting, but of trusting in the aide and succour of Iesus Christ: for feare fighteth directly against confidence.

How often doth the holy Scripture attribute effects vnto faith, which cannot agree to a ſimple conſent without truſt to the promiſe of God? Ieſus Chriſt in the Goſpell an hundred times at the leaſt vrgeth, that *He that beleeueth in him, hath life euerlaſting*, Iohn 6. 47. And S. *Paul*, Rom. 1. 17. ſaith, *that the iuſt ſhall liue by faith*. And in the fifth Chapter he ſaith, *that being iuſtified by faith, we haue peace towards God*: making peace of conſcience to ſpring from faith. All theſe things are falſe, if the Romiſh definition of faith be true: for all thoſe which beleeue that all that which God hath ſaid is true, haue not life eternall, for then the diuell ſhould be ſaued. To yeeld a conſent to the doctrine of the Goſpell, and not to truſt in the promiſe of God, procureth not peace of conſcience, but rather trouble and perplexitie.

Therefore Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 11. 1. who will haue vs to be followers of him, bindeth vs by his example, to ſpeake as he doth, and particularly to apply vnto our ſelues the promiſes of the Goſpell, by ſaying as he ſaith, 1. Tim. 1. 15. *This is a true ſaying, and by all meanes worthy to be receiued, that Chriſt came into the world to ſaue ſinners, of whom I am chiefe*. By ſaying, *This is a true ſaying*, he conſenteth to the doctrine of the Goſpell; but by adding, *I was receiued to mercy*, he applieth the promiſe of God (with a firme confidence) particularly to himſelfe. And ſo Galat. 2. 20. he ſaith, *The Sonne of God loueth me and hath giuen himſelfe for me*. Otherwiſe that which he ſaith, Epheſ. 3. 12. that *we haue boldneſſe and entrance with confidence by faith in Ieſus Chriſt*, ſhould be falſe. For can a man approach vnto God with cõfidence, if he diſtruſteth his promiſe? Thereby it appeareth that the Councell of Trent aforeſaid curſed and excommunicated the Apoſtle, by excommunicating thoſe that haue a particular affiance in the mercie and promiſe of God. The like abuſe it is to make a iuſtifying faith without knowledge, and to haue a man to beleeue without knowing: ſeeing that on the contrary, we muſt firſt haue knowledge to beleeue, that we may know what we beleeue. To haue a man to beleeue before he knoweth, is as much as to put out a mans eyes before we leade him. To beleeue

Ieeue ſo, is to beleeue we know not what, and onely to haue a good opinion of him that leadeth vs. But the Scripture doth ioyne faith with knowledge, Iohn 17. 8. *They haue knowne ſurely, that I came out from thee, and haue beleeued that thou haſt ſent me.* And Iohn 10. 38. *That ye may know and beleeue, that the Father is in me, and I in him.* And Iohn 6. 69. *And we beleeue and know, that thou art thee Chriſt.* For faith cõmeth by hearing of the Word of God, Rom. 10. And we heare the word of God to know it, and to be inſtructed therein. And knowledge is ſo neceſſary in faith, that ſometimes the word *Knowledge* is ſet in the place of faith: as in *Eſay* 5. 3. 11. whereas the Apoſtle ordinarily ſaith, that we are iuſtified by faith in Ieſus Chriſt, it is there ſaid, that *He ſhall iuſtifie many, by the knowledge which they ſhall haue of him.*

Then this faith which is moued by knowledge, and which entirely truſteth in the promiſe of God, neceſſarily abounds in good workes: For, from the knowledge of the loue which God beareth vnto vs, proceedeth our loue towards God. And it is altogether impoſſible to truſt in the promiſe of God without louing him. True faith is diſcerned from falſe, when it worketh by charitie, when it is ioyned with earneſt and hearty repentance: when it is humble, and truſteth not in her owne merits, but in the promiſe of God in Ieſus Chriſt, and when it kindleth zeale and the loue of God.

If *M. Arnoux* had vnderſtood what this word *Faith* importeth, and what the nature of true iuſtifying faith is, he would neuer ſay, that we placing our Iuſtification in Faith onely, make men negligent and careleſſe of good workes. He ſhould rather take heed, that vnder preſence of commending charitie, he ouerthroweth not faith: and that vnder a ſhadow of fearing God, he doth not reiect his grace, thinking to merit ſalnation by his owne righteouſneſſe.

As touching *Caluin*, whom *M. Arnoux* alledgeth, he neuer ſaid, that he himſelfe, or any particular perſon, was as well aſſured of the kingdome of heauen as Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe is. He ſpeaketh there of the body of the Church, con-

ſi ſting of the Elect, which can no more periſh then Chriſt himſelfe, becauſe it is one body with him. In ſuch manner neuertheleſſe, that all the firmneſſe & beatitude of the Church dependeth on Ieſus Chriſt. This is not to equalize or compare the Church to Ieſus Chriſt, but to ſay that it is ioyned vnto Ieſus Chriſt by an inſeparable band.

Of Iuſtification onely by faith: and of the word Iuſtifie.

ARNOVX.

34. Sect. *Places of the Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confeſſion. Rom. 3. 28. Therefore we conclude, that a man is iuſtified by faith, without the workes of the Law. And Galat. 3. 24. Wherefore the Law was our Schoolemaſter to bring vs to Chriſt, that we might be made righteous by faith. And Chap. 2. 16. Know that a man is not iuſtified by the workes of the Law, but onely by faith in Ieſus Chriſt.*

In the firſt and ſecond of theſe places, the word onely *is not there; and in the third, the word* onely *doth not in any ſort exclude the workes of the morall and Chriſtian Law, by the which Abraham and his children according to the Spirit are iuſtified, ſaith Saint Iames; but thoſe of the ceremoniall and figuratiue Law of Moſes, which ceaſed when the Sonne of God entred into the world. As the poſts or props of wood ſerue no more for any vſe, after the bridge of ſtone is perfectly built.*

MOVLIN.

To ſay that a man is iuſtified by faith onely, and to ſay that a man is iuſtified by faith without workes, are all one thing. For euen as in the queſtion, whether the man or the woman ought to be maſter, he that ſaith the man ought to be maſter in the houſe, and not the wife, ſaith alſo that the man ought onely to be maſter. So in the queſtion, whether man is iuſtified by faith or by works, or by the one and the other:

he that saith, that man is iustified by faith without works, by consequent saith, that man is iustified by faith onely. To stay vpon the words where the thing is cleare, is as much as to fly the truth. So the ancient Fathers vnderstood it. *Origen* vpon the third Chapter to the Romans saith, [a] *The Apostle saith, that Iustification by faith onely is sufficient.* [b] *Basil* in his Sermon of Humility saith, *The Apostle Saint Paul acknowledgeth himselfe to be poore concerning true righteousnesse, and that he was iustified by faith onely in Iesus Christ.* Saint *Hilarie* in the eighth Canon vpon *Mathew* saith, *Fides sola iustificat*, Faith onely iustifieth. *Chrysostome* in the Homily of Faith and of the law of nature saith, *Faith onely of it selfe saueth.* Saint *Hierome* vpon the third Chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians saith, [c] *Because no man obserueth the Law, therefore it is said, that the faithfull ought to be iustified by faith onely.* And a little after, [d] *To the end that by faith onely all nations should be blessed in Christ.* *Bernard* in the two and twentieth Sermon vpon the Canticles saith, *Being iustified by faith onely, we shall haue peace towards God.*

[a] Apostolus dicit sufficere solum fidei iustificationem

[b] οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος ἑαυτὸν δίκαιον συνῆς ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι πιστεύσας εἰς Χριστὸν δικαιοῦται

[c] Quia nemo illam seruat, ideo dictum est, quod sola fide iustificandi essent credentes.

[d] Vt sola fide benedicerentur gentes in Christo.

Our Doctor wrongeth himselfe to thinke that the works which Saint *Paul* excludeth, are the works of the ceremoniall Law. In the third Chapter to the Romans, verse twenty seuen, the Apostle concludeth, that *Man is iustified by faith without the works of the Law*, he there speaks of the morall law, by the which in the Chapter before, verse the 12. he said, that *Those that shall haue sinned shall be iudged*: and of the same Law he there saith, that *The Gentiles which haue not the Law doe by nature the things contained in the Law*, because they haue natural impressions thereof: the which Law in the same Cha. he saith the Iewes had transgressed by stealing, and by committing adultery: which cannot haue reference but to the morall Law. And in the fourth Chap. he insisteth to proue, that *Abraham* was not iustified by workes. It had bene in vaine for him to proue that *Abraham* was not iustified by the workes of the ceremoniall Law, seeing that the ceremoniall Law was not then made, neither was it giuen vntill foure hundred yeeres after.

Touching the Epistle to the Galatians, it is manifest that Saint *Paul* in the second Chapter, saying, that *Man is iustified by faith, and not by the workes of the Law*, excludeth from Iustification, not onely the workes of the ceremoniall, but also those of the morall Law. For in the 5. Chapter and fourteenth verse, he saith: *For all the Law is fulfilled in one word, which is this: Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy selfe.* And in the third Chapter and tenth verse, he saith, that Iesus Christ hath deliuered vs from the curse of the Law, euen from that Law which saith, *Cursed is euery man which continueth not in all things which are written in the booke of this Law to do them*: Which is a place taken out of the seuen and twentieth Chap. of Deuteronomie, verse 26. where it is spoken onely of the morall Law.

Notwithstanding we do not abolish good workes, although we exclude them from our iustification. No man can be iustified without workes, although he shall not be iustified by workes: euen as the eyes are not without the eares, and yet the eyes onely see, and not the eares. For faith onely hath the vertue to iustifie vs, that is, to cause vs to be absolued & accounted iust before the Iudgement-seate of God, because faith onely hath this propertie, to apprehend the benefit of Iesus Christ, and to appropriate his righteousnesse vnto vs.

Now, that which troubleth our Aduersaries in this question, is, that the word *Faith* and also the word *Iustifie*, by them is taken in another sence then it is meant in the Scripture, as often as it speaketh of our iustification before God. For the Councell of Trent in the sixt Session, and all our Aduersaries, by *iustifying* vnderstand *regenerating and sanctifying*; whereas the holy Scripture, when it speaketh of our Iustification before God, alwaies taketh the word *Iustifying* for *absoluing*, in the same sence that a man accused of a crime, is dismissed, being absolued & iustified. That appeareth by this, that iustifying is opposed against condemning, and consequently is as much as absoluing. As in Prouerbes, Chapter 17. verse 15. *He that iustifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the iust,*

euen

euen they both are abomination to the Lord. And Iob Chapter 9. verse 20. *If I iustifie my selfe, mine owne mouth shall condemne me.* And Deu. 25. 1. *Then they shall iustifie the righteous, and condemne the wicked.* And Matt. 12. 7. *By thy words thou shalt be iustified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.* And Rom. 8. 33. *It is God that iustifieth, who shall condemne?*

It is manifest by the first of the Corinthians, Chap. 4. ver. 4. what the Apostle vnderstandeth by *Iustifying*, and how he maketh account to be iustified. Speaking of administration in his Apostleship, he saith: *For I know nothing by my selfe, yet am I not thereby iustified.* He maketh not account to be iustified by his innocency, which should be false, if by Iustification he vnderstood holinesse of life, or regeneration, or if he pretended to be iustified by his workes. And in Matth. Chap. 11. verse 19. it is said that *Wisdome is iustified of her children.* Will our Aduersaries say, that the wisdome of God was regenerated or sanctified? It is most manifest that Iesus Christ would onely say, That the Wisedome of God was acknowledged to be iust, and exempted from the slanders of men.

If man be iustified by the workes of the Law, Saint *Paul* did wrong to magnifie with *Dauid*, *the blessednesse of those men to whom God imputeth righteousnesse without workes*, Rom. 4. 6. especially seeing that there he speaketh of the workes of *Abraham* and of *Dauid*, then when they were already in Gods fauour. For these causes you shall finde that Saint *Paul* neuer exhorteth vs to be iustified, because Iustification is not a vertue in man, but a Grace of God, whereby he absolueth sinners in beholding his Sonne. But his Epistles are full of exhortations to be sanctified and renewed, Romanes Chapter 12. ver. 1. 2. And therefore Romans Chap. 5. ver. 9. he saith, that *We are iustified by the blood of Iesus Christ.* And if by iustifying he vnderstood sanctifying or regenerating, he would rather say, that we are iustified by the Spirit of Christ.

How according to Saint Iames, man is iustified by workes.

ARNOVX.

44. Sect. *Contrarie places of Scripture. Iames 2. 24. You see then, how that by works a man is iustified, and not by faith onely.*

I alledge this Apostle, whose Epistle, and this place by them is acknowledged to be Canonicall. Can he more clearely and more manifestly contradict their article? and dare they yet make mention of their onely faith, altogether voyd, altogether barren, and altogether dead?

MOVLIN.

It is true that we speake of faith onely, altogether barren or bare, &c. but in detesting it as a shew of faith, a spirituall drowzinesse, and prophane sluggishnesse.

As for the place of Saint *Iames*, it is nothing to the purpose; for in this question we speake of our Iustification before God, but Saint *Iames* speakes of our Iustification before men: *Shew me* (saith he) *thy faith by thy workes.* He speakes of making our faith appeare vnto men by our works. But as touching Iustification before God, the Apostle Saint *Paul* declareth, that *Abraham* was not iustified by workes: *For if* (saith he) *Abraham were iustified by workes, he hath wherein to reioyce, but not with God.* And if Saint *Iames* intent had beene to proue that *Abraham* was iustified before God by works, he would not haue contented himselfe to set downe the onely sacrifice of *Isaak*, but would haue shewed the entire course of his obedience during his life. For if a man be iustified before God by workes, it should not be by one onely action, but the continuance of an holy and innocent life. *M. Arnoux* seeketh to proue that Saint *Iames* speaketh here of faith and of workes, as farre as they serue to saluation, which we willingly confesse. He saith also, that these words

not onely, shew that Saint *Iames* speaketh of the same sort of iustification. VVherein he is mistaken. If I say, that a man is learned, not onely in Philosophy, but also in Diuinity, doth it follow, that Philosophy and Diuinitie are all one kind of learning?

ARNOVX.

And what doth the Sonne of God moane, Luke 7. 47. when he speaketh of Marie Magdalen, to Simon that erred in faith, Many sinnes are forgiuen her for she loued much: to whom a little is forgiuen, he doth loue little? 45. Sect.

Then was Mary Magdalen iustified onely by faith, or haply did not the Sonne of God vnderstand the mystery of saluation so well as the Ministers?

MOLIN.

This place is nothing to the purpose, and speaketh not of iustification by workes. Note also that our aduersaries by iustification, vnderstand sanctification or regeneration: and so the end whereunto they aime, is to proue that we are regenerated by workes; a thing which we willingly grant. The question is, if by our workes we can stand before the Iudgement seate of God, and be iustified before God: which is not spoken of in this place. *Danid* cutteth them off clearely touching that, Psal. 143. verse 2. where he saith, *No man living can be iustified before God.*

Some alledge the place in Luke 7.47. to ground their merits, supposing that the word *for*, importeth a cause of iustification; whereas it is onely a marke. Of that we will speake more hereafter.

Of the Certainty of saluation, and of perseuerance.

ARNOVX.

In the same Article, somewhat lower, after they haue said, that we are iustified by faith onely, they adde: That is done for that the 46. Sect.

promises

promises of life which are giuen vs in him, are appropriated to our vse, and we feele the effects when we accept them, not doubting being assured by the mouth of God, that we shall be frustrated thereof. That is alwaies to assure euery man of his saluation, and to ground the interiour peace of conscience of the faithfull vpon presumption: which makes men liue without feare, and careleſſe of the time to come, as if a man were alreadie in poſſeſſion. But what is he among them, who if he haue his right wits, liueth and dieth in this assurance, freed of all feare? Wee may well perſwade and assure our ſelues, that God will hold his promiſe, but we cannot assure our ſelues of the vſe of his particular will, whereof God in the Scriptures giueth not any infallible promiſe vnto any man.

MOVLIN.

Now we enter into the queſtion touching the aſſurance of man to be ſaued, which is a point wherein our aduerſaries diſgrace our Confeſſion, and propound it otherwiſe then it is. They ſay that euery one of vs boaſt and brag, that wee haue a particular reuelation thereof, and that among vs euery one aſſureth himſelfe of his ſaluation. All that is falſe. For, to be aſſured of our ſaluation, we need not to enter into the ſecret counſell of God. Whoſoeuer ſeeketh by curioſity to enter into it, ſhall therein find his condemnation. Whoſoeuer will preſume to climbe ſo high, ſhall be throwne downe by deſpaire. The certaintie of our ſaluation ought not to be ſought for ſo farre off: it is found in the examination of our owne conſciences, conferred with the doctrine of the Scriptures. For if being ſeriouſly conuerted by true repentance, we haue recourſe to Ieſus Chriſt, and feele in our conſciences, that we haue no other hope nor affiance but in his death and paſſion, we haue the doctrine of the Goſpell, which declareth vnto vs, that *whoſoeuer beleeueth in him, ſhall not periſh, but haue eternall life*, Ioh. 3.15. This is the foundation of our aſſurance, and the ſupport of our faith.

It is alſo falſe, that euery one of vs boaſteth that he is aſſured of his ſaluation. It is true, that God commandeth vs to be aſſured thereof, but he wils vs not to boaſt, nor make

open

open profeſſion of it: and we are not bound to beleeue thoſe that brag thereof. For prophane perſons may boaſt of it, who by a vaine confidence imagine they ſhall aſcend vp into heauen, while in the meane time their vices weigh them downe to hell.

And which is more, this full certainty of faith, is a gift which God giueth not to all the faithfull at one time, nor in like meaſure; to ſome he giueth it ſooner, to others later, to ſome onely at the houre of death, and there are ſome who by prayer and good works ſeeking to fortifie their faith, are neuertheleſſe aſſailed with doubts touching the ſame, and haue not as yet that full confidence: who if they perceiue any proceeding thereof in themſelues, and an earneſt deſire to increaſe in this faith, we exhort them to take and eſteeme that conflict which they feele within themſelues, for a marke of their election.

Our Confeſſion then conſiſteth in theſe two points: the one, that God will haue vs to be aſſured of the accompliſhing of his promiſe: the other, that God giueth this aſſurance, to whom, when, and in what meaſure it pleaſeth him, but ſpecially at the houre of death: for then certainly it is moſt neceſſary.

This doctrine is grounded vpon the holy Scriptures. The Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, Rom. 8. 16. ſaith, *The Spirit of God witneſſeth with our ſpirits, that we are the children of God.* Can there be a more credible witnes then the Spirit of God? Can we without horror reade that which *Bellarmine* ſaith, Chap. 9. of his third booke of Iuſtification, *That the teſtimony of the holy Spirit is not certaine, but by a coniectural certainty*? that is, an vncertaine certainty. *He that beleeueth in the Sonne of God, hath the witnes of God in himſelfe*, 1. Ioh. 5. 10. Now we cannot without impiety accuſe the teſtimony of God of vncertainty. If *M. Arnoux* doth not feele this teſtimony in himſelfe, it is better for him to haue a bad opinion of himſelfe, then to contradict the Word of God, or to ſeeke to meaſure other men by his owne Ell, and to limit the Grace of God in others by the euill eſtate of his owne conſcience.

The

The Apoſtle to the Hebrewes, 3. 6. will haue vs *to hold faſt vnto the end the confidence and the glory of the hope.* And 4. 16. *Let vs therefore go boldly vnto the throne of grace, that we may receiue mercy, and finde grace to helpe in time of need.* And 10. 22. *Let vs draw neere with a true heart in aſſurance of faith.* For faith he, Epheſ. 3. 12. *By Ieſus Chriſt we haue boldneſſe, and entrance with confidence by faith in him.* S. *Iohn* in his firſt Epiſtle and fift Chapter will haue vs to be aſſured of eternall life: *Theſe things haue I written vnto you that beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God, that ye may know that ye haue life eternall.*

Let vs adde hereunto the promiſe of God, which is, to giue vs all things that we ſhall aske of him in the name of Ieſus Chriſt, Ioh. 16. 23. Let vs aske of him ſaluation and perſeuerance in faith, for God promiſeth to heare vs: and therefore Saint Iames 1. 6. will haue vs *to aske in faith and wauer not.* Therefore we muſt aske ſaluation of God without doubt or diſtruſt.

¶ Of this ranke are thoſe places in the Scriptures, which cõpare the teſtimony of the Spirit in the hearts of the faithfull, to a ſeale, or an earneſt penny to aſſure vs. Epheſ. 1. 13. *Wherein alſo after that ye beleeued, ye were ſealed with the holy Spirit of promiſe, which is the earneſt of our inheritance*: and 4. 30. *And grieue not the holy Spirit, by whom ye are ſealed vnto the day of redemption.* And 2. Cor. 1. 22. *Who hath alſo ſealed vs, and hath giuen the earneſt of the Spirit in our hearts.*

The Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, Rom. 8. 37. ſaith, *For I am aſſured that neither death, nor life, nor Angels, nor Principalities, nor any other creature, ſhall be able to ſeparate vs from the loue of God which is in Ieſus Chriſt our Lord.* For which cauſe alſo, going to die, he ſpeaketh as if he had the prize in his owne hand, and as being ready to lay hold vpon the crowne: 2. Tim. 4. 7, 8. *I haue fought a good fight, and haue finiſhed my courſe, I haue kept the faith: from henceforth is layd vp for me the crowne of righteouſneſſe.* And a little after: *The Lord will deliuer me from euery euill worke, and will preſerue me to his heauenly kingdome.* Is there any thing fuller of aſſurance, then that which *Iacob* ſaid lying on his death-bed, Geneſ. 49. 18. *I haue waited*

waited for thy ſaluation O Lord: or then that of *Dauids* words, Pſal. 17. 15. *As for me, I will behold thy face in righteouſneſſe, and ſhall be ſatisfied when I awake, with thy likeneſſe*: and in Pſal. 49. 15. *God will redeeme my ſoule from the power of the graue, for he ſhall receiue me*: or the words of *Simeon* when he approched neere vnto death, Luk. 2. 29. *Lord now letteſt thou thy ſeruant depart in peace according to thy word.*

All theſe holy ſeruants of God are condemned by the Councell of Trent, which ſaith thus in the ſixt Seſſion: *Whoſoeuer ſhall ſay, that the regenerated and the righteous man is bound to beleeue with certaine confidence that he is of the number of thoſe that are predeſtinated, let him be accurſed.*

To accuſe a man of preſumption that obeyes God commanding vs to be aſſured, and which putteth his truſt in the promiſe of God, is to conteſt and ſtriue with God vnder the ſhaddow of humility. This humility is prophane, and this modeſty is iniurious vnto God. It is as if a man ſhould ſay to God, It is true that thou haſt promiſed me, but I am not worthy to beleeue thy word: I am too baſe to truſt in thy promiſe. To ground the aſſurance of our ſaluation vpon our merits, is preſumption: but to ground our aſſurance vpon the promiſe of God, is faith and obedience.

Neuertheleſſe, to proue that we may be incredulous with reaſon, *M. Arnoux* alledgeth two things. Firſt, that we cannot aſſure our ſelues of the vie of our will. Whereunto I ſay, that God hath promiſed to gouerne our wils,* and to put his Law in our hearts, and to make vs that we ſhall not withdraw our ſelues from him, Ier. 32. 40. And Ieſus Chriſt ſaying, Mark 13. 22. that *Falſe Chriſts ſhall ariſe, and falſe prophets, ſhewing ſignes and wonders to deceiue, if it were poſſible, the very elect*, ſheweth that the elect cannot be ſeduced with a finall reduction, or irrecouerable. And God alſo promiſeth to heare vs when we aske perſeuerance of him. I conclude, to many places before alledged, which will haue vs to be aſſured of our ſaluation, preſuppoſe that God alſo will haue vs to be aſſured that he will not forſake vs: for without that there

* And I will make an euerlaſting couenant with the that I will not turne away from them to do the good: but I will put my feare in their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from me.

there can be no assurance.

The other reason alledged by *M. Arnoux* is, that God in the Scriptures makes no man any infallible promise. This reason is impious, and ouerthroweth all piety. For if *Henry* or *Charles* be not bound to be assured of his saluation, because it is not said in the Scripture, that *Henry* or *Charles* by name shall be saued, it followeth that those persons are not bound to be honest men, nor to feare God, because in the holy Scripture is not said, that *Henry* or *Charles* ought to be honest men. As the generall rules of piety bind all particular persons: so the generall promise, that whosoeuer beleeueth in Iesus Christ, hath life euerlasting, assureth euery particular person thereof that beleeues in Iesus Christ, although his name be not specified in the Scripture.

Whether a man is saued and elected vpon condition that he shall beleeue, and do good workes.

ARNOVX.

47. Sect. *Places of the Scripture noted in the margent of the Confession. Matth.* 17. 20. *And Iesus said vnto them, It is because of your vnbeleefe, for verily I say vnto you, if you haue faith as much as a graine of mustard seed, ye shall say vnto this mountaine, Remoue hence to yonder place, and it shall remoue, and nothing shall be impossible vnto you. Iohn* 3. 16. *For God so loued the world, that he hath giuen his onely begotten Sonne, that whosoeuer beleeueth in him, should not perish, but haue euerlasting life. These two places contains conditionall propositions, and therefore insufficient to giue the pretended assurance. The one saith, If you beleeue: The other saith, Whosoeuer beleeueth; but neither the one nor the other make any assurances, that such or such a particular person is endowed with true faith, nor that if he were so endowed, that he should perseuere. And the Sonne of God speaketh of a working faith: shew where are the termes that contains in them a safe-conduct of assurance?*

MOVRIN.

MOVLIN.

It is the ſame obiection that we haue formerly cleared in the end of the laſt ſection. The Scripture nameth not particular perſons, but giueth generall rules which binde them. We confeſſe that this propoſition; *Whoſoeuer beleeueth in Ieſus Chriſt, hath life euerlaſting*, is conditionall, and that life eternall is giuen onely to thoſe that beleeue. But this condition is not doubtfull, becauſe it dependeth vpon the counſell of God, and vpon his election, by the which he hath predeſtinated the elect to beleeue, and to do good workes. The Scripture ſaith not, that God hath elected any one becauſe he is faithfull, but that God hath giuen him grace to be faithfull, to the end that he ſhould be ſaued. So Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 7. 25. ſaith not, that God determined to ſhew mercy vnto him if he were faithfull, but ſaith, *I haue obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithfull.* And Epheſ. 1. 4. he ſaith not, that God hath elected vs, becauſe he foreſaw that we ſhould be holy, but, *that we ſhould be holy, and without blame before him in loue.* And Iohn 15. 16. *I haue choſen you, and ordained you, that you go and bring forth fruite.* And Rom. 8. 29. he ſaith, that *God hath predeſtinated vs, to be made like to the image of his Sonne.* Our faith and obedience is not a condition whereupon election dependeth, but an effect of election, and grace which God giueth to all thoſe whom he hath elected to ſaluation. I ioyne faith with obedience, becauſe faith it ſelfe in ſome reſpect is a kind of obedience, and becauſe it worketh by charity, Galat. 5. 6. In the thirteenth of the Acts, the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* preached the Goſpell in Antiochia. Of all his audience, thoſe onely which were ordained to life euerlaſting beleeued, as it is ſaid, verſe 48. He ſaith not that thoſe beleeued that we were diſpoſed or inclined to life eternall, but thoſe that were ordained thereunto. This Greeke word τεταγμένοι can be no otherwiſe interpreted, ſeeing that all of vs by nature are vndiſpoſed and vnapt to apprehend ſaluation and faith.

ARMOVR.

Contrarie places of Scripture. Eccleſ. 8. 14. *There is another* 84. *Sect.*

vanity

vanity which is done vpon the earth, that is, that there are wicked men that are as bold as if they had done the actions of the iust: but also I iudge this to bevaine.

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux falsification.

This place is all false. According to the Hebrew it is, *There is a vanity which is done vpon the earth, that is, that there be iust men, vnto whom it happeneth according to the worke of the wicked: againe, there be wicked men to whom it happeneth according to the worke of the righteous; I say, that this also is vanity.* This Doctor made his bragges to confound our Confession by our owne Bibles, and now he serueth his turne with his owne Bible falsified and contrary to the Hebrew.

And say that this place were not falsified, yet it maketh nothing against vs, that acknowledge that there is a false, a prophane, and a barren trust or affiance in good workes, which benummeth the conscience, in stead of kindling loue, and nourishing piety there in.

Of the feare of the faithfull, and whether it derogateth any thing from the certainty of salvation.

ARNOVX.

49. Sect.

1 Cor. 9. 27. *I beate downe, and bring my body into subiection: lest by any meanes when I haue preached to others, I my selfe should bereproued.*

And if hee did apprehend (as they say) nothing but the iudgement of man, he had no need to carry his mortification so farre, as to take vnto subiection his most inward and secret motions, and to pull downe the most liuely and secret prouocations of his flesh: but it had beene sufficient for him to haue vsed dissimulation, and some outward shew of pretended reformation. Now sith the Apostle trembled, where are those Reeles of the Desart, which say, they are the pillars of the Temple?

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

This Doctor makes vs to ſay that Saint *Paul* did apprehend nothing but the iudgement of men, and goes about to confute a thing forged by himſelfe, and which wee beleeue not. For on the contrary, 1 Cor. 4. 3. he declareth, *I paſſe very little to be iudged by you, or of mans iudgement.* The Apoſtle feared to offend God, and to faile in his charge: which is a vigilant feare, and not a feare of the diſtruſt of his ſaluation: whereof he ſpeaketh as aſſured in the paſſages before alledged, Rom. 8. 37. and 2 Tim. 4. 7. and 8. 18. We ceaſe not to trauell with care in things whereof the euent is ſure. Ieſus Chriſt auoyded dangers, although hee knew that his houre was not yet come. *Ezechias* had a promiſe to liue fifteene yeeres more: and yet he ceaſed not to eate, to attaine to that time. Saint *Paul*, Acts 26. 31. had a promiſe of God, that he ſhould ſcape ſhipwracke, and yet ceaſed not to exhort the ſailers to worke. So the faithfull man aſſured of his ſaluation, ceaſeth not to trauell by thoſe meanes, that are fit to attaine thereunto. Which aſſurance is not grounded vpon his owne force, but vpon Gods promiſe. Euen as a child that learneth to goe, when his father holds him by the hand, may be aſſured that hee ſhall not fall; not becauſe he is ſtrong enough of himſelfe, but becauſe his father leads him: ſo it is with the faithfull, of whom it is ſaid, Pſal. 37. 24. *Though the iuſt man falleth, he ſhall not be vtterly caſt downe, for the Lord vpholdeth him with his hand.*

I haue fought a good fight, I haue finiſhed my courſe; I haue kept the faith, from henceforth is laid vp for me the crowne of righteouſnes.

In the meane time, conſider what theſe Doctors are, that preach incredulity by modeſty, and that fearing to be proud, will dye in doubt whether they be the children of God, or of the diuell. Theſe are they that boaſt of their merits, yea, of merits of equiualence and of dignity, as they ſay, to giue God ſo much for ſo much, leſt hee ſhould complaine. But this is but a ſmall matter, for they make ſuperabundant, and ſupererogatory merits, doing more then God would haue them to do, that they may giue him more then enough. And yet when all is done, they know not whether they ſhall goe into heauen, or into hell.

Then heere you ſee the difference betweene true and falſe religion, which is, that true religion faſhioneth mens hearts to an humble confidence or aſſurance: but falſe religion formeth them to a proud diſtruſt. Which pride as it is prophane, ſo alſo their diſtruſt is moſt juſt. For he that truſteth in his merits, careth not for aſſurance. For hauing laid his foundation in the ayre, his expectation muſt of force hang in ſuſpence. Theſe Doctors teach men to truſt in themſelues, and to diſtruſt God: hanging their ſpirits betweene feare and ambition, trembling with feare to thinke vpon hell, and in the meane time preſuming to haue a degree of glory in heauen aboue the common Saints, which degree by Schollers is called *Aureola*.

This errour is nouriſhed by couetouſneſſe and ambition. For from a people that are in feare, a man may exact all whatſoeuer he will. We may eaſily feele in a mans purſe that is amazed or aſleepe. A man that beleeueth when he dyeth that he ſhall goe into Paradiſe, will not pay for Maſſes to be ſaid when hee is dead.

THE XXI. ARTICLE.

Whereupon M. Arnoux diſputeth of the certainety of perſeuerance.

We beleeue that we are illuminated in the faith by the ſecret grace of God, ſo that it is a free and particular gift which God giueth to thoſe to whom he will, in ſuch manner, that the faithfull haue not whereof to boaſt, being much more bound to obedience for being preferred before others, for that faith is not giuen vnto the faithfull for a while, to leade them into the good way; but to make them continue therein to the end. For as it conſiſts in God to make the beginning,

ſo it is in him to finiſh it.

Arnovx.

By theſe words they pretend, that he that once hath true faith, neuer falleth, and that faith cannot be loſt: that it is no more in mans liberty, after he hath receiued that grace of God, to leaue it: that by conſequence he is confirmed in that grace: and in purſuite thereof in good workes, which a little after they ſay are neceſſarily ioyned to faith. Is not this after a ſort to make euery one of them without ſinne? Alas! and where are thoſe holy and conſtant perſons to be found among them? And if there be any ſuch, why do they with Caluin teach, that all the workes of the faithfull deſerue death?

Movrin.

He that will exactly examine the words of this 21 Article of our Confeſſion, ſhall find nothing of all that which *M. Arminius* maketh it to ſay. It doth not ſay, that all thoſe that haue faith, are aſſured to continue therein vnto the end, but that faith is giuen to continue to the end: which no man can contradict, but he that will haue a man to leaue and forſake the ſeruice of God after he hath once begun well. And to be ſhort, in all this Article there is no mention made of the certainty of perſeuerance.

Neuertheleſſe, although he wander out of the way, we will follow him by his ſteps, and manifeſt and explane vnto the Reader the certainty of perſeuerance.

Firſt, we do not deny, that there is a faith for a time, and which perſeuereth not to the end. The holy Scripture ſpeaketh thereof in many places: as Math. 13.20. Iohn 2.22,23. Hebr. 6.4,5,6. and in other places.

Secondly, we confeſſe and acknowledge, that the faith of the elect groweth by degrees, and that as it waxeth ſtronger, ſo the certainty of perſeuerance increaſeth. Yet while it increaſeth, there is ſtill ſome remnant of infirmity in man, and the fleſh ſuggeſteth doubts, ſo that this certainty is not giuen to all the elect in like meaſure.

Onely we ſay, that whoſoeuer turneth vnto God by true repentance, and by an vnfained faith hath apprehended the benefit of Ieſus Chriſt and the promiſe of God, he ought to be aſſured and to beleeue that God will not forſake him, and will giue him grace to perſeuere: and that God will haue vs to haue this aſſurance, and promiſeth vs perſeuerance: and that he giueth this aſſurance to his elect, to ſome ſooner, to others later, and in diuerſe meaſure: but that ſpecially he giueth it to his children at the houre of death.

This certainty of perſeuerance is taught vnto vs in the word of God, Ier. 32. 39. 40. where God makes this promiſe, *I will giue them one heart, and one way, that they may feare mee for euer: I will make an euerlaſting couenant with them, that I will not turne away from them to doe them good.*

Ieſus Chriſt, Mark. 13. 22. ſaith, that *Falſe Chriſts ſhall ariſe, and falſe prophets, and ſhall ſhew ſignes and wonders, to deceiue, if it were poſſible, the elect.* Shewing that the elect cannot finally be ſeduced, and by conſequence ſhall perſeuere vnto the end. Therefore the Apoſtle in the beginning of his Epiſtle to *Titus*, calleth this faith whereof we ſpeake, the *faith of the elect*: to ſhew, that it can no more faile then election it ſelfe: whether it differ in kind, or in degree onely from temporall faith: yet the certainty thereof is not grounded vpon his own force, but vpon the continuall aide and aſſiſtance of God: and this aſſiſtance depends vpon election.

Ieſus Chriſt, Ioh. 6. 39. ſaith, *This is the Fathers will which hath ſent me, that of all which he hath giuen me, I ſhould loſe nothing.* Now thoſe whom the Father hath giuē to Ieſus Chriſt, are the elect, whom ſeeing Ieſus Chriſt promiſeth not to loſe but to keepe them alwayes, it is neceſſary that they ſhould perſeuere vnto the end.

Our Lord, Ioh. 4. 14. ſpeaking of the Spirit which he giueth to thoſe that are his, promiſeth *to giue them water, whereof whoſoeuer drinketh, ſhall neuer be more athirſt, but that it ſhall be in him a well of water ſpringing vp vnto eternall life*: which cannot be without perſeuering to the end.

Saint *Paul* Rom. 8. 35. aſſureth himſelfe of this perſeuerance,

rance, saying, *Who shall separate vs from the loue of Christ?* And a little after, 38. *For I am assured, that neither death, nor life, nor Angels, &c. shall be able to separate vs from the loue of God.* So Iesus Christ promiseth the gift of perseuerance to Saint *Peter*, Luk. 22. 32. when he saith vnto him, *I haue prayed for thee that thy faith faile not.*

In the first Psalme the faithfull are compared to a tree whose leaues neuer fall. Iesus Christ compareth them to a man that hath built his house vpon a rocke, which standeth fast against all stormes and tempests, Math. 7. 24. Saint *Peter* in his first Epistle, 1. 23. saith, that *The word of God dwelling in their hearts, is an vncorruptible seed, liuing and enduring for euer.* And before, verse 5. he said, that *We are kept by the power of God, through faith, vnto saluation.*

To the same end it is said, that the true faithfull are oftentimes called members of Iesus Christ: for it is not to be beleeued, that Satan can cut off or pull away the members of Iesus Christ, nor yet diminish his body. As also that the regeneration of the faithfull is called a birth, Iohn 3. 3 and a resurrection, Reuel. 20. 6. For this second birth cannot be made voyde by death. And the Spirit of God, Reuel. 20. 6. saith, *That the second death* (which is damnation) *hath no power on him that hath part in the first resurrection.* Now if a man truly regenerated, could entirely lose faith and godlinesse, and after returne againe and be reestablished by repentance, besides this second birth whereof the Scripture speaketh, there should be a third and fourth birth, whereof the Scripture maketh no mention. And though we had not so many places of Scripture for the certainty of perseuerance, yet so many places alledged in the 46. Section, whereby God will haue vs to be assured of our saluation, do necessarily presuppose the assurance of perseuerance: for without it faith waereth, and floateth in vncertaintie.

All this being grounded vpon the constant and vnvariable election; vpon the nature of God, whose gifts and callings are without repentance, Rom. 11. 29. vpon the promises of God before set downe: God dresseth that which he hath

planted. He giueth, becauſe he hath formerly giuen. His firſt graces inuite and draw on thoſe that follow, and are promiſes for the time to come.

It may well fall out, that the faith of the faithfull hardly aſſailed, may ſometime languiſh, as thoſe that faint and fall into a ſwoune. So it hapned to *Dauid*, *Salomon*, and Saint *Peter*, and to many faithfull ſeruants of God, whom yet God recouered againe out of their trance. For, that *Dauid* in his fall did not wholly loſe the Spirit of God, it appeareth by that which he himſelfe ſaith, Pſal. 51. 11. *Caſt me not away from thy preſence, and take not thy holy Spirit from me.* Then he had that Spirit ſtill. And for *Salomon*, God himſelfe, 2. Sam. 7. 14, 15. promiſed, that *If he committed iniquitie, he would chaſten him with the rod of men, but that his mercy ſhould not depart from him.* Whereby it appeareth, that by this doctrine we do not make our ſelues without ſinne, as M. *Arnoux* chargeth vs.

Howbeit this perſeuerance, although it be neceſſary, is neuertheleſſe voluntary, and without conſtraint. In the 21. Section we haue ſhewed, that there are voluntary neceſſities, and that conſtraint and not neceſſity is repugnant to liberty. All of vs neceſſarily deſire to be happy, & yet with freedome of will. It is not to be asked whether the Elect can reſiſt the grace of God, for all of them for a time reſiſt it, and of their owne nature can do no other thing. But God in his ſecret counſell hath decreed to bend their wils, that they will not reſiſt vnto the end. That which *M. Arnoux* makes vs and *Caluin* ſay, that all the workes of the faithfull are worthy of death, is ſlanderous, and nothing to the purpoſe.

ARNOVX.

51. Sect. *Places of the Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confeſſion.* 1. *Corin.* 1. 3, 9. *Vvho ſhall alſo confirme you vnto the end, that you may be blameleſſe in the day of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt. God is faithfull, by whom you are called vnto the fellowſhip of his Sonne Ieſus Chriſt our Lord, Iude, 3. It was needfull for me to write vnto you, to exhort you, that you ſhould earneſtly contend for the maintenance*

tenance of the faith which was once giuen vnto the Saints. And Rom. 11. 29. For the giftes and calling of God are without repentance. Note, hee will ſtrengthen you, becauſe it is by him, and not by your ſelues, that you ſhall be conſtant, ſo you be conſtant, and there ſhall be no want in him, or on his part. Hee hath called you to the communion, that is not to ſay, that you ſhall continue therein; but if you continue therein, hee will be faithfull vnto you, to giue you that which hee hath promiſed you. Faith hath once beene giuen to the Saints; is it therefore to be ſaid, that it is for a time onely, or for euer, or without loſing, or recouering it againe? To be ſhort, the giftes and calling of God are without repentance, becauſe God neuer recalleth that which he hath done. Thy deſtruction commeth of thy ſelfe, O Iſrael.

Note, it ſhall not want on Gods part.

MOVLIN.

This is a blow on the nayle, by our Aduerſary giuen to three places of Scripture ſet downe in the margent of the 21. Article of our Confeſſion, to ſhew that they are wrongly alledged to prooue the certainty of perſeuerance; which is as much as to fight againſt his owne ſhaddow: for thoſe places are not brought to prooue the certainty of perſeuerance, whereof there is nothing ſpoken in that Article.

Adde heereunto, that we haue already confuted that in the 47. Section, where we haue ſhewed, that Gods decree to giue perſeuerance to his Elect, is not a conditionall, but an abſolute decree. And it were a contradiction to ſay, that God giueth perſeuerance to the faithfull, if they perſeuere: or to ſpeake (as Mr. *Arnoux* ſaith) that by the grace of God they ſhall be conſtant, ſo they be conſtant. But eſpecially he ſpeaketh with a good grace, to ſay, that there ſhall be no wanting on Gods behalfe. This Doctour imagineth, that God ſaith vnto vs, Doe your endeuour and I will doe mine: It is not my fault, but you hinder me from doing that which I would willingly do. This Diuinity is hypochondriacall: and the example which hee ſetteth downe in his anſwer, is childiſh. *If* (ſaith hee) *I ſhould ſay to a ſicke perſon, Thy Phyſician will ayde, and not leaue thee to the end; ſhould it thence follow,*

that the ſicke man cannot diſobey the Phyſicions order? Surely God is not like the Phyſicion that cannot giue the will to his patient to ſuffer him to rule him: but God giueth his Spirit to his Elect, which diſpoſeth them to obedience.

The place of Scripture, *Thy deſtruction cōmeth from thy ſelfe, O Iſrael*, is not to the purpoſe touching the perſeuerance of the Elect: for that is ſpoken of reprobates.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. 1. *Cor.* 10. 12. *Wherefore let him that thinketh he ſtandeth, take heede leſt he fall.*

It may then be that he may fall, and he cannot fall vnleſſe he ſtands; and if he ſtood, he had faith. Who then dares contradict Saint Paul, that he that hath faith, cannot loſe it?

MOVLIN.

52. *Sect.* Saint *Paul* in that place ſpeaketh to thoſe that are preſumptuous and negligent, and that truſt in their own ſtrength, and ſaith vnto them, Let him that thinketh himſelfe to be very ſure and firme, take heed that he falleth not into ſuch faults whereby his preſumption and weakeneſſe may be knowne. For by *falling* he vnderſtandeth not to loſe faith, as *M. Arnoux* imagineth, but to fall into faults, whereby his falſe truſt may be conuinced. But to gratifie our Aduerſary, put the caſe that Saint *Paul* ſpeakes to thoſe that haue true faith. In that ſence, I ſay, that either the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of finall falling, whence men neuer recouer again, or of faults whence men recouer againe, and which ſometimes befall the moſt holy men, as Saint *Peter* and *Dauid*, &c. If he ſpeake of faults whence men recouer againe, this makes nothing againſt finall perſeuerance, which we ſpeake of here. If he ſpeakes of finall falling, and whence men neuer recouer againe, this inſtruction is not vnprofitable to thoſe that are aſſured of their ſalvation. For thoſe that truly ſtand vpright, ſhould not be careleſſe of falling. The aſſurance that they haue to go into the kingdome of God, hindereth them not from turning into the

the way to hell, but bindeth them to be wary thereof. For mans will ought to obey Gods decree. Thoſe whom God hath ordained to perſeuere vnto the end, ought to vſe the meanes to attaine thereunto. He whom God hath preordained to liue an hundred yeeres, ſhould be carefull not to want food by his negligence. For the confidence which wee haue that God will ſaue vs, is no cauſe of negligence. And to be ſhort, to the end that no man ſhould ſerue his turne with that place of Scripture to weaken the certainty of perſeuerance, Saint *Paul* addeth, verſe 13. *There hath no temptation taken you, but ſuch as appertaines vnto man; and God is faithfull, which will not ſuffer you to be tempted aboue that yee bee able, but will euen giue the iſſue with the temptation, that yee may be able to beare it.* By theſe words, hee ſtrengtheneth men with aſſurance that God will giue them grace to perſeuere.

ARNOVX.

Philip. 2. 12. *Make an end of your owne ſaluation with feare and trembling.* 53. Sect.

But why ſhould hee tremble that hath no feare, and knowes himſelfe to be aſſured?

MOVLIN.

This feare and trembling is not the feare of hell, but a feare to offend God; it is a childe-like feare, and not a ſeruile feare: a feare that quickeneth ſlowneſſe, and is not contrary to faith.

And although the Apoſtle ſhould here ſpeake of the feare of hell, what is that to the purpoſe? For who knoweth not, that the Apoſtle giueth inſtructions to all ſorts of perſons, and by conſequence alſo vnto thoſe that doubt of their ſaluation? To men that are not forward in godlineſſe, the feare of hell ſerueth for a compulſion and a good reſtraint from euill. But this feare decreaſeth as faith increaſeth, and taketh deeper roote: euen as ſcaffolds made about buildings, are by degrees pulled downe, as the building goeth forward and is perfected.

THE

THE XXII. ARTICLE.

Whereupon M. Arnoux moueth the queſtion, whether faith can be without good workes.

We beleeue by this faith we are regenerated to newneſſe of life, being naturally ſlaues to ſinne. Now by faith we receiue grace to liue holily and in the feare of God, by receiuing the promiſe which is giuen vnto vs by the Goſpell, that is, that God will giue vs his holy Spirit. Thus faith not onely doth not quench the affection to liue well and holily, but begetteth and quickneth it in vs, neceſſarily producing good workes. And although God, to accompliſh our ſaluation, doth regenerate vs, reforming vs to do good, neuertheleſſe we confeſſe, that the good workes which we do by direction of the holy Ghoſt, are not required to iuſtifie vs, or to merit that God therefore ſhould hold vs for his childrē: for that we ſhould alwayes flote in doubt and vnquietneſſe, if our conſciences did not reſt vpon the ſatisfaction whereby Ieſus Chriſt hath freed vs before God.

ARNOVX.

54. Seſſ. *If it be true, that he which hath faith, neceſſarily doth good workes, it followeth, that he which doth not good workes, cannot haue faith.*

MOVLIN.

That is true, ſo that by faith we vnderſtand a liuely faith, a true confidence in Ieſus Chriſt, a cōfidence that is not grounded vpon our merits, but vpon the promiſe of God: a faith working by charity, Galat. 5. 6. not the faith of the Romane Church,

Church, which onely beleeueth that all that which God hath ſaid is true, which the Diuels alſo beleeue: nor the faith of the people of the Church of Rome, that make profeſſion to beleeue all that which God hath ſaid, without knowing what he hath ſaid, and without being inſtructed in his Word. Such a faith may be, and is ordinarily without good worke.

ARNOVX.

And which of the holieſt and conſtanteſt Miniſters dare firmely 55. *Sect.*
aſſure himſelfe that he doth good workes, without being condemned of pride, lying, and folie, by his owne ſectaries? And then none of them can aſſure themſelues of faith, wanting good workes, which are the effects thereof.

MOVLIN.

Not onely the Miniſters, but the leaſt and meaneſt of the people that loue and feare God, know well when they do good workes, and are well aſſured, and doubt not, but that ſuch workes are pleaſing and acceptable vnto God, and that he beareth with the imperfection and want that is in them for the loue of Ieſus Chriſt. But they do not brag and boaſt, nor yet preſume by them to merit of God And therefore are no afraid to be condemned by any man, of pride, lying, or folie, becauſe they make no man acquainted therewith, but rather condemne then iuſtifie themſelues. *M. Arnoux* neither knoweth what we ſay, nor what our beliefe is, nor yet what his owne is.

ARNOVX.

Theſe are manifeſt contradictions, to ſay that faith cannot be 56. *Sect.*
loſt, that it is neuer without good workes, that a man is aſſured of his faith, and yet that he cannot aſſure himſelfe of his workes.

MOVLIN.

It is an eaſie thing with *M. Arnoux*, to make vs to contradict our ſelues, by making vs ſay things which he knoweth

well

well that we say not, and which we beleeue not no more then hee doth. It is certaine that he argueth not against our Confession, but against his owne fictions, and an imaginary confession. To know with what equity he dealeth with vs, let the Reader remember, that before in the fiftieth Section, hee saith, that we make our selues without fault, that is, without sinne; and now he attributeth the contrary vnto vs, and maketh vs say, that the holiest Ministers dare not assure themselues that they doe good workes. So before hee reproued vs, that wee make a bare faith, voyd of good workes; but heere he himselfe produceth our Confession, which saith, that faith necessarily produceth good workes. By this meanes he iustifieth vs, and silently confesseth that he hath slandered vs. Furthermore, these things agree well together, for a man to haue a certaine confidence of faith accompanied with good workes, and yet not to trust in his owne good workes: for the more that a man trusteth in God, the more he distrusteth himselfe; the more that a man resteth vpon the merits of Iesus Christ, the more he renounceth his owne merits.

ARNOVX.

75. Sect. *Places of the Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confession. Iames 2.14. What auaileth it, my brethren, though a man saith hee hath faith, when he hath no workes? can that faith saue him? Galat. 5. 6. For in Iesus Christ neither circumcision auaileth any thing, neither vncircumcision, nor any vertue, but faith which worketh by loue, Iohn 1. 2, 3. My little children, these things I write vnto you, that you sinne not. And hereby we are sure that we know him, if we keepe his commandements. And 5.18. We know that whosoeuer is borne of God, sinneth not; but hee that is begotten of God, keepeth himselfe, and that wicked one toucheth him not. And 3. 3. And euery man that hath this hope in him, purgeth himselfe euen as he is pure.*

In all these places of Scripture, there is not one word more or lesse, that signifieth that faith necessarily produceth good workes, and the word necessarily, *is neither in truth nor in appearance in any of them.*

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

Thele places ſerue to proue that which our Confeſſion ſaith, that is, that faith ſtirreth in vs an affection to liue well, and neceſſarily produceth good workes. The Scripture is full of prooſes hereof. The Apoſtle to the Hebrewes, 12.32. and 33. maketh a great rehearſall of the ſeruants of God, who by faith did worke righteouſneſſe. Saint *Peter*, Acts 15. 9. ſaith, that *God hath purified the hearts of the Gentiles by faith.* Saint *Paul*, Rom. 8 1. ſaith, that *There is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Ieſus, which walke not after the fleſh, but after the Spirit.* Adde hereuno the places quoted in the margent of our Confeſſion, which *M. Arnoux* produceth, Iam. 2. 14. that *Faith without workes cannot ſaue.* Galat. 5. 6. that *Faith worketh by loue.* Which fiue places *M. Arnoux* confeſſeth that they ſay, that faith produceth good workes; onely he ſaith, that the word *neceſſarily* (which is in our Confeſſion) is not found in any of them. I am aſhamed to trouble myſelfe with ſuch childiſh things. If in our Confeſſion we had ſaid, that God is neceſſarily iuſt, *M. Arnoux* would haue quarrelled with vs about it, and would haue ſaid, that the Scripture ſaith that God is iuſt, but ſaith not that he is neceſſarily iuſt. What? Is not the Word of God neceſſarily true? And when the Apoſtle ſaith, that faith worketh by loue, is it not neceſſary that it ſhould worke by loue, to be that faith whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh? Is it probable onely or contingently that faith inciteth vs to good workes? That is not to ſpeake like a man, nor vnto men.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. Titus 1. 16. *They profeſſe that they knew God, but by workes deny him, and are abominable and diſobedient, and to euery good worke reprobate.* 38. Sect.

MOVLIN.

Gideons bottles had beene as much to the purpoſe as this which he alledgeth; what makes that to proue that the faith of

of the elect may be without good workes? Who knowes not that there is a falſe faith, and that many make a good profeſſion, and are of an euill conuerſation?

ARNOVX.

99. Sect. *Iames* 2. 14. *If any one ſaith that he hath faith when he hath no workes, can that faith ſaue him?*

We ſee well that he denieth not that faith cannot be without good workes, but onely that without workes, it is of no value.

MOVLIN.

But Saint *Iames* ſaith euidently, that faith can be without good workes, becauſe he ſpeaketh of a dead faith, of an hypocriticall faith, of a faith like vnto that of the Church of Rome, by which a man beleeueth that the Word of God is true, but beleeueth not that the promiſes of God appertaine vnto him. Such a faith is without good workes. But not the faith of the true faithfull ſeruants of God, by the which they are iuſtified before God.

ARNOVX.

60. Sect. *In Saint Matthew* 13. 22. *Chriſt expounding the parable of the ſower, ſaith, He that hath receiued the ſeed among thornes, is he that heareth the Word, but the cares of this world, and the deceitfulneſſe of riches choked the Word, and it is made vnfruitefull.*

MOVLIN.

It is an abuſing of the Reader, to alledge places of the Scripture ſo little to the purpoſe. This place proueth not, that the true faith of the elect, (which is iuſtifying faith, whereof our Confeſſion ſpeaketh) can be without good workes.

Of the firſt and ſecond Inſtification, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

ARNOVX.

ARNOVX.

In the ſame Article ſomewhat lower: Neuertheleſſe we confeſſe that the good workes which we do by the guidance of his Spirit, are not brought into an account to iuſtifie vs, or to merit that God ſhould eſteeme vs for his children. If they vnderſtand that no man can merit his firſt iuſtification, that is true, and in that ſence we are freely iuſtified. 61. Sect.

The holy Scripture ſpeaketh but of one iuſtification by the which a ſinner is iuſtified before God, which iuſtification is the abſolution of a ſinner by vertue of the death of Ieſus Chriſt, & by the imputation of his righteouſnes. The Church of Rome, which by iuſtification vnderſtandeth regeneration or ſanctification, may not onely make two iuſtifications, but an hundred alſo, if they will take the degrees of our proceedings in our regeneration for ſo many iuſtifications.

In the meane time it is good to know in what ſence *M. Arnoux* confeſſeth that we are freely iuſtified. The holy Scripture attributeth the remiſſion of ſinnes to the mercie of God, and to the redemption in Ieſus Chriſt; but for ſanctification, or regeneration, it is an effect of the holy Spirit, which for that cauſe is called the ſpirit of ſanctification. Therfore when the Apoſtle, Rom. 5. 9. ſaith, that we are iuſtified by the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, & 3. 23. that we are freely iuſtified, it is clearer then the day-light, that by iuſtifying he vnderſtandeth abſolution, and not regenerating. Theſe words of free regenerating ſound not currantly: but to ſay that God freely pardoneth vs, is to ſpeake according to reaſon, and agreeable to the holy Scripture. Coloſ. 2. 13. *He hath freely pardoned vs all our offences.* But the Church of Rome, which peruerteth al the Scripture, by iuſtifying freely, vnderſtandeth freely to regenerate: And therby maketh two regenerations, whereof the firſt is freely, and the other not freely, but merited, as if God gaue vs ſome graces not freely, nor of his meere liberality.

Of

Of Merits.

Arnovx.

62. Sect. *But they pretend, that workes done by the grace of the holy Spirit, are not meritorious; as if the holy Spirit were not able to worke in vs, and by vs, and with vs, such things as are worthy of himselfe.*

Movlin.

Our aduersaries will haue workes done by grace and the aide of the holy Ghost, to be meritorious. This is a bold assertion. For there is not any man in France, what seruice soeuer he hath done for the king, that dares presume to say to the king, that he hath deserued to be made rich by the king. And which is more, if we merit eternal life, God should be vniust, if he giues it not vnto vs; for it is iniustice to withhold a seruants wages from him which he hath deserued. By this meanes we are in a good case, and neede doe no more but to aske payment of God, if he will not be vniust. Then seeing it is so, it shall not be amisse to examine these merits, and to know the value and possibility of them.

In this point the Masse and the Councell of Trent are at variance. For in the Canon of the Masse which is said euery day, the Priest maketh this prayer: *Receiue vs into the fellowship of thy Saints,* [a] *not weighing our merits, but granting vs pardon by Iesus Christ our Lord.* But the Councell of Trent in the sixth Session hath ordained otherwise, [b] defining, that the good workes of a righteous man are in such manner gifts of God, as that they are also our merits; and that a man by the grace of God, may not onely merit eteruall life, but also an augmentation of glory, that is, a degree of blessednesse in heauen more then ordinary. The opinion of *Thomas* is, [c] that our good works, for so much as they proceed from the holy Spirit, condignely or worthily merit, that is, by equality in value. But that the same merits, for so much as they proceed from our owne free will, onely merit by congruity, and by right of well beseeming or correspondence, but not in rigor of iustice.

[a] *Non est aestimator meriti, sed veniae largitor.*

[b] *Si quis dixerit, hominis iustificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, vt non sint etiam bona ipsius iustificati merita, &c. Anathema sit.*

[c] *Thomas 1. par. 2. Quaestione 14 art. 3.*

But

But now adayes merits are higher aduanced. Cardinall *Bellarmine* which wrote in Rome with a generall approbation, and is commonly followed, in his fifth booke of Iustification, chap. 7. saith, [d] that it is more honorable to obtaine a thing by a mans owne desert, then to haue it by the onely gift of God. And in the fourteenth Chapter he saith, [e] That *God will wholly equalize the worke and the reward, to the end that no man should haue lesse recompence then he deserueth, to iudge rightly, which is commutative iustice.* This iustice is that which giues one for another, or so much for so much. And after he hath gone about in the seuenteenth chapter, to proue that good works *etiam sine pacto*, that is, without the promise of God, haue a proportion with life eternall, he concludeth his proposition by a doctrine, which he saith is the common doctrine of Diuines, which is, *that the [f] good workes of the righteous merit eternall life by condignity or worthinesse, not onely in consideration of the promise and the acceptation, but also in consideration of the worke, in such sort that in good worker proceeding from grace, there is a proportion and equalitie to the price of eternall life.* From whence he inferreth in the eighteenth chapter, [g] That *God is become debtor vnto vs, not onely because of his promise, but also because of our workes.* So that we may say, that this Prelate is ready with Counters in his hand, to reckon with God, and to shew him how much he is in arrerages.

The beliefe of our Church is contrary to that. We say, that good works are necessary to saluation, not as causes of saluation, but as the way to attaine thereunto; *via regni, non causæ regendi.* Good workes serue to glorifie God, to edifie our neighbour, by exercise thereof to strengthen faith, to leade vs to saluation: but they are not the price of the obtaining of saluation, which is sufficiently gotten for vs by the free redemption obtained by Iesus Christ.

It is sufficient to possesse or enioy the kingdome of God, as Children of God, & by the title of Heires, and to receiue it of free gift, without boasting to possesse it by the title of buyers or purchasers thereof by our owne merits. Seeing that

[d] *Magis honorificum est habere aliquid ex merito, quàm ex sola donatione.*

[e] *Deus constituet absolutam æqualitatem inter opera & mercedis, vt vnusquisque non in horam habeat mercedem quàm iusto iudicio mereatur, quod est iustitiæ commutatiuæ.*

[f] 17. § Iam verò opera bona iustorum meritoria esse vitæ æternæ non solum ratione pacti & acceptationis, sed etiam ratione operis, ita vt in opere bono ex gratia procedente, sit quædam proportio & æqualitas ad præmium vitæ æternæ.

[g] Non ex sola promissione, sed etiam ex opere nostro Deus efficitur debitor.

that we haue in our hands a price of infinite value, whereby the kingdome of God is obtained for vs, that is, the merit of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, what neede haue wee to buy that with our owne merits, which Ieſus Chriſt hath bought for vs, and which God of his meere liberality giueth vnto vs?

2 The holy Scripture pricketh this ſwelling pride, and wholly bereaueth man of this confidence and truſt in his merits: For it calleth ſalnation a gift of God, and not a purchaſe by our merits, Epheſ. 2. 23. *For the wages of ſin is death, but the gift of God is eternall life*, Rom. 6. 23. Vpon which place Saint *Auguſtine* ſaith thus, *Whereas the Apoſtle might truly haue ſaid, That the wages of righteouſneſſe is life eternall; he choſe rather to ſay, That the Grace of God is life eternall; that thereby we ſhould vnderſtand, that God leadeth vs to life eternall by his mercy, and not by our merits.*

Cap. 9. de gratia & libero arbitrio. Cum poſſet dicere & recte dicere ſtipendium iuſtitiæ vita æterna, maluit dicere Gratia autem Dei vita æterna, vt hinc intelligeremus, non pro meritis noſtris, Deum nos ad æternam vitam, ſed pro ſua miſeratione perducere.

3 The ſame Apoſtle, 2. Tim. 1. 9. ſaith, *He hath ſaued vs, and called vs with an holy calling, not according to our workes, but according to his owne purpoſe and grace, which was giuen vnto vs through Ieſus Chriſt before the world was.* Note theſe words, *He hath ſaued vs*, to confute *M. Arnoux* gloſſe, who onely confeſſeth, that the firſt iuſtification, that is, the beginning of regeneration, proceedeth not from our merits, but touching ſalnation he ſaith that we merit it. Cleane contrary to the Apoſtle, who denieth that we are ſaued by our workes.

4 Therefore, when queſtion is made, to know by what meanes we obtaine eternall ſalnation, the ſame Apoſtle oppoſeth the Grace of God againſt works, as things diſagreeing, Rom. 4. 4. *To him that worketh, the wages is not counted by fauour, but by debt.* You may well ſay he ſpeakes to our Aduerſaries, ſaying: To you which put your truſt in your works, the reward of life eternall muſt not be reputed for a free gift of God, but for a thing due to you: as before we haue heard *Bellarmine* boaſt that God is debtor vnto vs. And you muſt note, that the Apoſtle ſpeakes of *Abraham* at ſuch time as he beleeued in God, and that faith was imputed vnto him for righteouſneſſe; to the end that no man ſhould thinke or conceiue

ceiue that he ſpake of vnregenerated perſons, or of works that are done by naturall force.

5 The ſame Apoſtle, Romans 11. 6. ſaith, *If it be of grace, it is no more of works, or elſe grace were no more grace: But if it be of works, it is no more grace, or elſe works were no more works.* Then to obtaine eternall life by the Grace of God, and to obtaine it by our works, are things contrary. The merits of our aduerſaries are they not works? And if they obtaine ſaluation by their merits, ſaluation is no more a grace of God. Some of them excuſe themſelues and ſay, that wee merit it by the ayde and help of the Grace of God, and that our merits are not acceptable, vnleſſe they be died with the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, and that Ieſus Chriſts merits make ours availeable.

6 Whereby they get nothing, for ſeeing that the grace of God excludes mans merits, how ſhall we merit by his grace? Did Ieſus Chriſt merit, that I might merit, ſeeing it is the merit of Ieſus Chriſt which makes my merits ſuperfluous? for he merited expreſly, to the end that we ſhould no more be bound to obtaine ſaluation by our merits. The Apoſtle to exclude the merits of works, propoundeth the Grace of God, ſaying: *If it be by grace, it is not by works.* Then how will they haue vs to merit by grace? To merit by grace, is a thing as much diſagreeing, as for a man to freeze with heate, or to be wet with drineſſe. For grace preſuppoſeth a gift, and to merit is a kind of buying: ſo to merit by grace, is to buy by meere gift: which is a ridiculous conceit.

7 To conclude, God giueth no man grace, to derogate or diſparage his grace, nor vertue, to obtaine by merits a thing already fully gotten by the merit of Ieſus Chriſt. As for this imaginarie dying with the bloud of Chriſt, I ſay that Ieſus Chriſt doth not die our works with ſo high a colour. Let vs rather learne to diſburthen our ſoules of pride, then to ſtuffe this ſhapeleſſe idoll, inuented by men, beſides, yea contrary to the Word of God.

8 The example of yong children that die ſhortly after they are baptized, is moſt cleare and manifeſt for this purpoſe. For our Aduerſaries grant that thoſe children poſſeſſe life e-

ternall without merits, by vertue of the free adoption in Iesus Christ. Now there are not diuers meanes of saluation according to the diuersitie of persons, in such manner that one should be saued without merits, and another by his merits.

9 Free election is an inuincible proofe against merits. The Scripture speaketh of men elected, predestinated, and preordained to eternall life, Ephesians 1.4, 5. Romans 8.9. Acts 13.48. and saith, that this election is free. *Paul* calleth it, *The election of grace*, Romans 11.5, 6. Now to shew how it is by grace, he expoundeth it, adding that it is not by workes, saying: *Euen so then at this present there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if it be of grace, it is no more of workes.* and 9.11, 16. *That the purpose of God might remaine according to election, not by workes, but by him that calleth.* And then addeth: *So then it is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth mercy.* To attaine to this saluation, whereunto they are predestinated, God freely giueth them his holy Spirit, which imprinteth faith in them, & frameth their minds to good workes. Eph. 1.4. *God hath chosen vs in Iesus Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy.* Phili. 2.13. *For it is God which worketh in you both the will and the deed, euen of his good pleasure.* Iohn 15.5. *For without me can ye do nothing.* 2 Cor. 3.5. *But our sufficiencie is of God.* Then if we haue not merited to be elected to saluation, we haue not merited to be saued. If neither the election to saluation, nor the meanes giuen vs to attaine to this saluation, are not merited, how shall this saluation be merited? To say, that God hath freely predestinated vs to merit saluation, it is to contradict our selues. For it is as much as to say that God freely predestinateth vs to be saued, but not freely. If a man should freely giue me an house or an inheritance two hundred miles from hence, vpon condition to go thither to take possession thereof, and conducteth me in the way, nourisheth me, releeueth me when I fall, setteth mee on the way when I go wrong, giueth me strength to go vntill such time as he putteth me in possession: can I say that I haue

gotten

gotten this inheritance by my merits? ſhall my ſteps be the price of the acquiſitiō or getting thereof? This giuer is God, thoſe to whom it is giuē, are the Elect; the inheritance giuen, is the kingdome of heauen; the way to attaine thereunto, are the cōmandements of God: euery good work is a ſtep in this way; In which way if we ſtumble, or go wrong, God vpholdeth vs and ſets vs in the way again, & giueth vs ſtrength to go forward: and being at the end of our iourney, ſhall we be ſo brutiſh to preſume to reckon our ſteps for merits? yea and for merits of condignitie or equiualence, and to thinke that God is debter vnto vs? But what can the Creator owe the creature? or what can he owe vnto vs, vnto whom we to owe our ſelues?

10 Thoſe that are of opinion that God hath elected this or that man, not becauſe or in conſideration of his good works, but becauſe he foreſaw that they ſhould beleeue in Ieſus Chriſt, fall into the like inconuenience, becauſe they ſpeake of faith as of a kind of worke, and of a vertue in the faithfull; which they make to precedes the Election of God. And I ſee no reaſon, why they will not haue good works alſo a condition which precedes the Election of God, ſeeing that God electeth none but thoſe that ſhall do good works, and that good works are as neceſſary to ſaluation as faith is. Then we muſt ſay, that God hath freely elected thoſe whom it pleaſed him, and that to them freely and without merit he giueth his holy Spirit, which in their hearts imprinteth a liuely faith working by charitie.

11 If we would comprehend what this word *merit* importeth, the difficulty would ſoone be decided. There are ſixe things required to merit.

1 The work that is done, muſt not be a work that is due to be done, for it is no merit for a man to pay his debts.

2 We muſt offer that which is our owne. For to preſent any thing to the King that belongs vnto him, that is no merit.

3 The worke that a man doth to merit of any man, muſt be fit for his vſe and purpoſe. For a man cannot merit of any man by a worke that ſhall be vnprofitable for him.

4 The worke that we do to merit withall, muſt not be defectiue, and wherein there is any thing to be pardoned.

5 There muſt be ſome proportion alſo betwene the worke and the reward, that a man will merit by the work.

6 Laſtly, the thing that we deſire to obtaine by meritorious works, muſt not be already obtained by another former meanes: for to ſeeke of a proprietary or poſſeſſor to be a purchaſer, it is to diſmiſſe or let go the propriety. By theſe ſixe reaſons following, the Word of God teacheth vs that we cannot merit of God.

1 Firſt, all the good that we do, is a thing due, as Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, Luk. 17.10. *When you haue done all thoſe things which are commanded you, ſay, We are vnprofitable ſeruants, we haue done that which was our duty to do.*

2 All the good that we do comes from God, and by conſequence cannot merit at Gods hands. 2. Cor 3. 5. *Not that we are ſufficient of our ſelues to thinke any thing as of our ſelues, but our ſufficiency is of God.* Phil. 2. 13. *For it is God which worketh in you both the will and the deed, euen of his good pleaſure.* He crowneth his owne gifts, and repayeth not our merits.

3 Our works are no profit vnto him. Pſal. 16. 2. *My goodneſſe extendeth not to thee.* It is true, that they are pleaſing vnto God, for God loueth that which he doth, but yet they are not meritorious. For if they merited, it ſhould be God that ſhould merit, and not man. The *Mother Tereſe*, tranſlated by *Monſieur de Berulle*, which nameth himſelfe, The Confeſſor of the bleſſed, ſaith with a good grace, that *the ſeruants of God haue taken ſo much paines to aide our Lord.* cap. 3. fol. 11.

4 Moreouer, our good works are imperfect, and there is alwaies ſome defect in them, Rom. 7. *The Spirt ſtriueth againſt the fleſh*, Galat. 5. 18. So that we alwayes ought to grow in grace, and alwayes haue need to aske pardon. The loue of a thing is according to the knowledge that a man hath thereof: now here we know but in a part and obſcurely, as S. *Paul*, 1. Cor. 13. 9, 12. ſaith: therefore now we loue but in part and imperfectly.

5 If

5 If we compare the worke with the reward which we pretend to merit, what compariſon is there betweene imperfect works, and which in a moment paſſe away, and an eternall and celeſtiall kingdome? Martyrdome is one of the moſt excellent works, notwithſtanding the Apoſtle, Rom. 8.18. ſaith, *I count that the afflictions of this preſent time, are not worthy of the glory which ſhall be ſhewed vnto vs.* 2. Cor. 4.17. *Our light affliction which is but for a moment, cauſeth vnto vs a ſoare more excellent and an eternall weight of glory.*

6. Laſtly, how can we by our merits obtaine eternall life, which is already obtained for vs by our redemption in Ieſus Chriſt, and which appertaineth vnto vs, in as much as we are Children of God, adopted in Ieſus Chriſt? Galat. 4.7. *If thou art a ſonne, thou art alſo an heire through Chriſt*, Rom. 8. 17. *If we be children, we are alſo heires, euen the heires of God, and heires annexed with Chriſt.* Whereupon alſo the kingdome of God is not called a purchaſe by our works, but *an inheritance*, Epheſ. 1.14,18. Whoſoeuer pretendeth by his merits to purchaſe the inheritance that he hath from his father, caſteth off childlike affections, and renounceth his ſucceſſion, and of a ſonne and heire, becomes mercenary and a purchaſer, and in concluſion goeth about to pay God with coyne ouer-light.

12 For this alſo is one of the great diſeaſes of the Church of Rome, who not contenting her ſelfe to gaine Paradiſe by her merits, brings in diuers other works for merits which are none, and which not onely do not merit a reward, but rather deſerue puniſhment: as to pray without vnderſtanding what they ſay: to faſt for another man: to kiſſe holy graines: to ſay their *Pater-noſter* and *Aue Mary* by tale vpon a paire of beades: to go to the Iubile: to worſhip relicks, to run on pilgrimage into Spaine, leauing their houſes, worke and families: to make garments to put vpon images: to take from their poore children, to giue to rich Monks, &c. Theſe are the works, for which God is indebted vnto men, & is in arrerages vnto them. Now if good works become euill when they are done in pride, as thereby to bind God to men,

How much leſſe are euill works meritorious to ſaluation, and all this traſh of humane inuentions which they preſent vnto God for merits? For our aduerſaries thinke that they haue reaſon to preſume, that God is not vnthankfull vnto thoſe that do good vnto him.

The effects of this doctrine of pride are ſufficient to ouerthrow it. For theſe men that are ſo laden with merits, ſay, that they know not whether they ſhall be ſaued or not, and die in feare and diſquietneſſe of conſcience: It is (ſay they) a kind of raſhneſſe to aſſure our ſelues of our ſaluation. This diſtruſt is moſt iuſt; this doubt of theirs is well groũded, ſeeing that the truſt of our merits is without ground. For who knoweth the value or worth of euery merit? Who knowes for how much euery peece of this money goes currant in Paradiſe? Who knowes when he hath done merits enow? Therefore the deuouteſt men buy other mens merits, and (as the Prieſt doth in the Maſſe) aske ſaluation of God for the merits of the Saints.

From this truſt that any mã hath of his merits, there ſpringeth a moſt euident conſequence, that is, that whereas according to the Scripture, faith produceth good works, here on the contrary, works produce faith, and are the foundation of the hope of ſaluation. That which *M. Arnoux* thruſteth in by the way touching works of ſupererogation, ſhall be hereafter examined apart.

ARNOVX.

63. Sect. *Places of the Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confeſſion.*

Pſal. 16. 2. O my ſoule, thou haſt ſaid vnto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: my goodneſſe extendeth not vnto thee.

It is very true, that our works ſerue for nothing vnto God, and that he hath no need of them: but doth it therefore follow, that being conformable to his Law, and done by his holy Spirit, that they are not pleaſing vnto him, and worthy of commendation, that is to ſay, meritorious?

MOVLIN.

They are pleaſing vnto him, and worthy of commenda-

tion,

tion, but not meritorious.

ARNOVX.

Luke 17.16. *So likewise ye, when ye haue done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are vnprofitable seruants, we haue done that which was our duty to do.* 64. Sect.

This place makes nothing for them, as I haue shewed in the Article.

MOVLIN.

But on the contrary it is euident and manifest against merits, because they are vnprofitable to God; and you haue said nothing against it, but onely that you said, that they that do more then they are bound to do, are no vnprofitable seruants: which is another abuse worse then the first, whereof I will speake hereafter.

ARNOVX.

Rom. 4. 1. *What shall we say then, that Abraham our Father hath found concerning the flesh? For if Abraham was iustified by works, he hath wherein to reioyce, but not with God.* 65. Sect.

Abraham by workes, voyd of faith, (whether they were morall or ceremoniall) could not be iustified, nor haue any glory, but before men; and faith onely without works did not iustifie him, saith Saint Iames. But faith ioyned with works got him true glory, and iustified him before God.

MOVLIN.

It is false that Saint *Paul*, Rom. 4. 1. said, that *Abraham* was not iustified by the works of the ceremoniall Law, whereof Saint *Paul* had not yet spoken in all the precedent Chapters, and which was not a law in *Abrahams* time.

It is false also that Saint *Paul* said, that *Abraham* was not iustified by morall works without faith. For he speakes expressly of the works that *Abraham* did hauing faith, then when *Moses* saith of him, *Abraham beleeued, & it was imputed vnto him for righteousnesse*, Gen. 15. 6. He beleeued then, and yet it was from that time that Saint *Paul* saith, that his faith

was

was imputed vnto him for righteouſneſſe. Which is confirmed by the example of *Dauid*, added to that of *Abraham*, who alſo eſtabliſhed righteouſneſſe without works, when he wrote the 32. Pſalme, wherein he placeth all the bleſſedneſſe of man in the remiſſion of ſinnes: at which time *Dauid* was regenerated and iuſtified. It was of morall works, and done by him in the time of his Apoſtleſhip, that Saint *Paul* ſpake, 1. Cor. 4. 4. ſaying, *For I know nothing by my ſelfe*: and he addeth thereunto, *yet am I not thereby iuſtified.*

ARNOVX.

66. Sect. *He hath ſaued vs, not by the works of righteouſneſſe which we had done, but according to the waſhing of regeneration and renewing of the holy Spirit, Tit. 3. 5.*

That is true, that our works without the Sacraments of Baptiſme and of Penance which renew vs, cannot ſaue vs. Thoſe Sacraments are neceſſary, either done in vow or in act, but what ſerues that for the Article?

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux falſification. You falſifie this place of Scripture. This is the truth of it. *He ſaued vs, not by the works of righteouſneſſe which we had done, but according to his mercy, by the waſhing of the new birth, and the renewing of the holy Spirit.* You haue left out theſe words, *but according to his mercy*: which excludes merits. If by the word regeneration, Saint Paul vnderſtandeth Baptiſme, or interior ſatisfaction, it is another queſtion. But to the purpoſe, is not this place expreſly againſt merits, ſeeing he ſaith, that God hath not ſaued vs by our works? Touching that which *M. Arnoux* addeth, that Baptiſme and the Sacrament of Penance are neceſſarie either by vow or in act, it ſhalbe examined hereafter. By the way, let the Reader mark, that *M. Arnoux* eſteemeth not Baptiſme to be neceſſary to ſaluation, ſeeing that a vow is ſufficient; and that he holdeth that a man may be ſaued without doing actuall Penance, for he holdeth that it is ſufficient that a man hath at intent to do it.

ARNOVX.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. Iames 2. 21. Was not Abraham our Father iuſtified through works, when he offered Iſaac his ſonne vpon the altar? 67. Sect.

Do you not ſee, that man is iuſtified by works, and not by faith onely?

MOVLIN.

It is true, before men: but not before God, as the Apoſtle, Rom. 4. 2. ſaith, *For if Abraham were iuſtified by works, he hath wherein to reioyce, but not with God.* But ſeeing that our aduerſaries take the word *iuſtification* for *regeneration*, it is in vaine for them to obiect this place againſt vs; for we know that man is not regenerated onely by faith. Charitie, and other Chriſtian vertues, are alſo a part of regeneration.

Whether God is debter vnto vs. And touching the reward.

ARNOVX.

Heb. 6. 10. For God is not vnrighteous, that he ſhould forget your works. And therefore if he ſhould forget it, he ſhould be vniuſt, and he cannot be vniuſt in this caſe, but in refuſing that which he oweth. 68. Sect.

MOVLIN.

Theſe words are horrible. If God ſhould deny life eternall to *M. Arnoux*, he ſhould deny him that which he oweth him, and God ſhould be an ill payer of his debts. It may be he is afraid that he will play bankrupt, for how ſhould he pay ſo many debts? The miſchiefe is, that the Ieſuite hath no meanes to conſtraine him, nor to ſummon him. Let this Doctor learne, that God is iuſt in rewarding our good works, not becauſe our works deſerue it, but becauſe Gods promiſe is ſuch. It is a iuſt thing to accompliſh a promiſe. A man may promiſe one a thing that he hath not yet deſerued. A man may reward one that hath not deſerued a reward.

ward. For there are full rewards which are giuē in consideration of the person, & not for the merit of the worke. As a father giueth a new coate to his sonne as a reward for making of a line with a shaking hand. He would not reward another in that manner, which should haue done an hundred times as much. That which in Matthew 5.36. is called a reward, in Luke 6.32. is called grace, χάρις. And the penny giuen to the workmen that came at the last houre, is called a reward: although much aboue their desert, Math. 20. Saint *Ambrose* writeth expresly vpon this place, in the first Epistle of his first booke: *There is* (saith he) *a kind of reward which is giuen of liberality and of grace, and another which is the wages of vertue, and the recompence of a mans labour.*

Alia est merces liberalitatis & gratiæ, alia virtutis stipendium, laboris remuneratio.

ARNOVX.

69. Sect. *If they did not reiect Ecclesiasticus, I would entreat them to consider of the sixteenth Chapter, vers.* 14. *Make way for euery worke of mercy, for euery man shall finde according to the merits of his works, and according to the vnderstanding of his pilgrimage. And the* 3. 15. *of Wisedome: He found them worthy for himselfe. Dignitie and merit are all one thing.*

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux falsification ἕκαστος γὰρ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶ κρινεῖται

This place of Ecclesiasticus is horribly falsified. This word of merit is not found therein. In the Greeke which is the originall, there is, *Euery man shall finde according to his works*, and not according to the merit of his works. This falsification is very remarkable.

Reuel. 3 4. Luk. 20 35. Luk. 10 7.

Touching the place of the third of Wisedome, *He found them worthy of himselfe*, *M. Arnoux* sheweth how little he is acquainted with the Scriptures: for in stead of producing places out of the Canonicall bookes, where oftentimes the faithfull are called worthy, he brings vs a place out of the Apocrypha, and which is not in the Hebrew Bible. But to conclude, I say, that if any man be worthy of saluation, it is God that makes him worthy, and not his merits. Dignity is no merit before God, seeing that dignitie comes from God. And I

say

say, that if mans dignity came from man himselfe, and from his owne strength, yet there should be no merit before God, who cannot be bound to his creature, and to whom our good works bring no profit. Much lesse can there be any merit towards God, seeing that all the dignitie in man proceedeth from his liberality, and what dignity soeuer is in man, it is mixed with much imperfection.

Whereas the Scripture saith, that God will reward men according to their works, as Saint *Paul* 2. Corinthians 5. 10. saith, *That euery man may receiue the things done in his body, according to that which he hath done, whether it be good or euill.* Pope *Gregory* the first, vpon the seuenth Psalme of mercie, noteth very well, *That is one thing to render to euery one according to his workes; and another to render vnto them for their workes. It is one thing to speake of the cause of saluation, and another to speake of the qualitie of those to whom it is giuen.*

Aliud reddere secundum opera, aliud propter opera; aliud agere de causa salutis, aliud de qualitate eorum quibus datur.

Of workes of Supererogation.

ARNOVX.

We confesse that we are vnprofitable seruants, in this, that whosoeuer obserueth the commandement, without doing any more then he is bound to do, shall haue no other recompence then that which followeth the obseruation of the commandements, and shall be esteemed vnprofitable, as touching the receiuing of the fulnesse of recompence that followeth those that do something more then that wherevnto they are bound. 70. Sess.

MOVLIN.

It is not enough to seeke to merit life eternall by works, as our Aduersaries say, for *M. Arnoux* will perswade vs, that there are some which merit more then life eternall, and a degree of glory in heauen aboue the ordinary sort of men. *M. Arnoux* saith, that those that obserue the Commandements of God, and do no more then that wherevnto they

are

are bound, ſhall haue no other recompence then that which followeth the obſeruation of the commaundement, that is to ſay, that all their recompence ſhall be life eternall, which is promiſed to thoſe that accompliſh the Commandements of God. Thoſe that haue no other perfection but onely that they haue perfectly obeyed God, are vnprofitable ſeruants, and incapable of a greater glory: therefore they muſt be content with eternall life, without pretending to haue more. But there are ſome that do more then God will haue them to do: and (as *M. Arnoux* ſaith) that do ſomething more then that which they are bound to do: thoſe ſhall haue the full accompliſhing of the recompence, and a glory aboue the common ſort. This is a new Goſpel, drawne out of the vnwritté word. This is a doctrine full of courage, which eſteemeth it a ſmall thing to fulfill the Law of God, and ſtudieth for another perfection, for feare to be an vnprofitable ſeruant. This ſurpluſſage which is done ouer and aboue that whereunto a man is bound, is that which they call Counſels of perfection, and works of ſupererogation, perfecter, and more excellent then all that which God commandeth in his Law, and more then to loue God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himſelfe. Such is perpetuall virginity, martyrdome, and diſtribution of all that a man hath vnto the poore, Monaſticall vowes of obedience, pouerty, and chaſtitie. Of theſe that do theſe ſupererogatorie works, Cardinall *Bellarmine* in the thirteenth Chapter of the booke of Monkes, ſaith, *That they loue God more then they are bound to do.* Thoſe (following *Bellarmine*) *M. Arnoux* ſaith, are not vnprofitable ſeruants. But he tells vs not to whom they are profitable: for it is neceſſarie that they ſhould be profitable, either to God, to themſelues, or to their neighbours. To God they are not, for he hath no need of our ſeruice. Then they muſt either be profitable to themſelues or to their neighbours. Then how are they, who by their merits obtaine nothing but eternall, called vnprofitable ſeruants, ſeeing that *M. Arnoux* will not deny, but that they profit themſelues, and do the like to their neighbours?

Quoeritur ſi addam alterum gradum plus quàm teneor atque eo modo facio actum (ſupererogationis & conſilij.

We

We on the contrary acknowledge our ſelues tobe ſo farre off from being able to do more then that which God commandeth, that we are farre from being able to do that which he commandeth; and putting all our hope and confidence in the mercie of God, ſeeke not after a degree of glory aboue the ordinarie ſort of the elect: in what degree of glory ſoeuer we be, it ſufficeth vs, ſo we may be with our Sauiour, and ſee the face of our God. In the meane time we reiect not the counſels which are found in the Scripture. It is wiſe counſell to abſtaine from lawfull things, that a man may the eaſier accuſtome himſelfe to leaue vnlawfull things. It is wiſe counſell to abſtaine from meates which God permitteth to eate, when a weake conſcience may be troubled thereby. It is wiſe counſell to a Miniſter of the Church, not to take any reward, when he can make ſhift without it, or when the aduerſaries take occaſion thereby to make his preaching ſuſpicious. It is wiſe counſell to a man that is continent, not to marrie, to the end that he may not be diuerted by domeſticall cares, and ſo beare perſecution the eaſier. But we call theſe counſels, counſels of Chriſtian wiſdome, and not of perfection; the obſeruation whereof is not meritorious, nor ſupererogatorie, but a thing much leſſe then the accompliſhment of the Law.

Our reaſons againſt theſe counſels of perfection or works of ſupererogation are theſe.

1 God in his Law commandeth vs to loue & to ſerue him with all our hearts, and with all our ſtrength. And a man can do no more then his ſtrength will permit him to do. *Bellarmine* will, in effect, haue vs by this word *all*, to vnderſtand *part*. So that when the Scripture ſaith a thing is *white*, wee muſt vnderſtand *blacke*. If ſuch interpretations be permitted, what euident teſtimony would be found in the Word of God? *Lib. de Monachis cap. 13.*

2 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* to the Philippians, chapter 4. 8. commandeth vs *To thinke on thoſe things that are iuſt, pure, commendable, and honeſt*. If works of ſupererogation be iuſt and pure, they are commanded by the Apoſtle, and ſo are not ſupererogatory: If they be not iuſt nor pure, we muſt not obſerue them.

3 If

3 If a man cannot accompliſh the Law, much leſſe then can he do more then the Law commands. Iam. 3. 2. *For in many things we ſinne all,* 1 King. 8. 46. *For there is no man that ſinneth not.* Pſal. 116. 11. *All men are liers.* All the Apoſtles daily ſaid, *Forgiue vs our offences. Noah, Abraham, Dauid, Iob,* Saint *Peter,* and the moſt excellent ſeruants of God, ſinned. *Iob* is called iuſt & perfect, and yet curſed the day of his birth. It is ſaid of *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth,* Luke 1. 6. that *they were iuſt before God, and walked in all the Commandements and Ordinances of the Lord, without reproofe.* But theſe words, *without reproofe,* muſt be expounded, that they walked in ſuch ſort in the Commandements of God, that no man could reproue them in any thing: notwithſtanding it appeares that *Zacharias* was a ſinner; for that not long after he was puniſhed, becauſe he did not beleeue the Word of God declared vnto him by the Angell. Then how can we preſent vnto God more then he asketh, ſeeing we cannot giue him that which is his due? How can we do ſuperabundant workes, if we be wanting in neceſſarie workes?

4 The perfection of Angels, Pſal. 103. 20. it is ſaid to conſiſt in executing the commandement of God. Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe ſaith, that he came to do the will of him that ſent him, Iohn 6. 38. and Heb. 10. 7. Theſe Doctors doing more then the Will of God, ſurpaſſe the Angels and Ieſus Chriſt himſelf, who could haue attained to Monaſticall perfection, if he had thought vpon or remembred to haue done workes of ſupererogation.

5 I would alſo know of our Aduerſaries, that do more then God will haue them to do, and that by conſequence exceed the commandement of God, if in doing thoſe workes of ſupererogation, they do the Will of God, or their owne? If they do the Will of God, then they do no worke of ſupererogation, but a neceſſary worke. If they do their owne will, how dare they ſay that their will is perfecter then the Will of God?

6 If to do theſe ſuperabundant workes, God giueth them his Spirit and his aſſiſtance, then neceſſarily they are bound to do them, leſt they ſhould make the Grace of God of no effect.

fect. And ſo they ſhould no more be works of ſupererogation, becauſe they are bound to do them.

7 But is not this to wrong the Law of God, which is the Rule of righteouſneſſe, and to accuſe it of imperfection, to go about to do perfecter works then thoſe which the Law commandeth? The Righteouſneſſe of the Law is poore and miſerable, if ſinners can exceed it. If there be Rules of perfection aboue the Law, what followeth, but that the Law is an imperfect Rule?

8 But is not this an intolerable pride, to make Monks profitable ſeruants of God, and *Abraham*, *Iacob*, *and Dauid* vnprofitable ſeruants, becauſe they did none of thoſe works of ſupererogation?

9 I am afraid, that he which intrudes himſelfe to do more ſeruice vnto God then he will haue him to do, in the end will find himſelfe ill paid for his ſeruice. For, who required that at his hands? where do we find in the Word of God the inſtitution of Monks and of Monaſticall vowes?

10 Compare theſe ſuperabundant works with thoſe which God commands, and you ſhall finde much inequality in them. For the Loue of God commanded in the Law is alwayes good and neceſſary: but the vow of ſingle life is euill, for thoſe that haue not the gift of continencie 1. Corin. 7. 9. *For better it is to marry then to burne.* To giue all our goods to the poore, is oftentimes a great ſinne, if by that meanes wee bereaue our children of them, deceiue our creditors, & diſinherite our right heires. Piety doth not ouerthrow nature. 1. Tim. 5. 8. *He is worſe then an Infidell, that hath not a care of his family.* Is piety like a frenzy, which maketh a man forget iuſtice? It may ſo happen, that ſome men with hypocriſie or ambition will giue all their goods to the poore, as S. *Paul*, 1 Cor. 13. 3. ſaith. Adde hereunto, that Monks that make vows of chaſtity, pouerty, and obedience, are by experience conuinced of the contrary. For the vow of chaſtity makes them vnchaſte, and abſtinence from marriage puſheth them forward to adultery. They make a particular vow of pouerty, to be rich in common, and follow a fat and idle kinde of beg-

ging, in ſtead of a ſober and vigilant labour. They make a vow of obedience to the rule of Saint *Francis*, or Saint *Ignatius*, and diſpenſe with themſelues for not obeying the Commandements of God.

11 Touching Martyrdome, there are two ſorts, one which God calleth men vnto, the other, whereunto men raſhly thruſt themſelues. God calleth men to martyrdome, when a man cannot ſaue his life, but by renouncing true Religion: Then Matyrdome is a worke commanded, and ſo neceſſary, that without it, in that caſe, a man cannot be ſaued. It is not then a ſuperabundant worke: it is not a counſell, but a commandement. For God in his Law commandeth vs to loue him aboue all things, therefore more then our liues. In this caſe then, whoſoeuer would ſaue his life, ſhall loſe his ſoule. He that ſhall deny Ieſus Chriſt before men, Ieſus Chriſt will deny him before his Father. But if Martyrdome be vndertake raſhly, and if a man run into it without being called thereunto, then it is a tranſgreſſion of the commandement of Ieſus Chriſt, which ſaith, Math. 10. 23. *When they perſecute you in one City, fly into another.* And it is againſt Saint *Pauls* example, who to eſcape from his enemies, cauſed himſelfe to be let down in a basket out at a window in Damaſcus. Faith walketh betweene raſhnes and cowardiſe. In time of need, it maketh the faithfull reſolute to die, but it is not angry or vnwilling to liue. Withal, in Martyrdome there are two things, the dolor and paine of the body, and the conſtancie and zeale of faith. The dolor of the body is not a vertue, but an exerciſe of vertue. Firme faith is a vertue commanded by God, and not a perfection beyond the Commandement of God.

12 Adde vnto that a demonſtratiue proofe, that is, that a good thing of it ſelfe, is alwayes better then a thing that is not good, but becauſe of another thing. So life is better then meate, becauſe meate is made to maintaine life. So it is with the Loue of God commãded in the Law compared with theſe works of ſupererogatiõ. For the Loue of God is alwaies holy, good, and neceſſary, but to diſtribute our goods, or to ſuffer Martyrdome, is not good, vnleſſe it be done for the Loue

of

of God. If we ioyne theſe things together, the diſtribution of our goods to the poore is not good, but becauſe men are moued thereunto for the Loue of God. If you ſeparate them, the Loue of God alone is good and holy: but the diſtribution of our goods without the Loue of God is a fault, an iniuſtice, and hypocriſie.

13 The example which our Aduerſaries take out of the nineteenth of Saint *Mathew*, makes nothing for this abuſe. A preſumptuous yong man ſaid, that he had kept Gods Commandements from his youth vpward: to whom Ieſus Chriſt ſaid, verſe 21. *If thou wilt be perfect, go ſell that thou haſt, and giue it to the poore, and thou ſhalt haue treaſure in heauen.* Our Aduerſaries ſay, that Ieſus Chriſt did onely counſell, and not command the yong man to ſell all his goods, with a counſell of perfection; and that this treaſure in heauen is a Glory aboue the ordinarie Glory of the Saints, promiſed to thoſe who hauing accompliſhed the Law, do ſomething more, and follow a greater perfection.

To cleare this, we muſt know that this yong man abuſed himſelfe and lyed, in boaſting that he had accompliſhed the Law. For Ieſus Chriſt accuſeth him of putting his truſt in his riches, Marke 10. 14. And in forſaking Ieſus Chriſt, and preferring his goods before Ieſus Chriſt, he manifeſtly ſhewed his couetouſneſſe. He that loueth his riches more then Ieſus Chriſt, doth not loue him with all his heart, and with all his ſoule, and by conſequence hath not accompliſhed the Law. *Chryſoſtome* in his 64. Homilie vpon Saint *Mathew* ſaith, That he was couetous. Saint *Auguſtine* in his 89. Epiſtle ſaith, That yong man anſwered more arrogantly then truly, that he had obſerued the Commandements of the Law. *Baſil* in his Sermõ againſt Riches ſpeaketh thus to the yong man: *It is euident that thou art farre eſtranged from this commandement, and that thou gineſt falſe witneſſe of thy ſelfe.* Seeing therefore that this man had not fulfilled the Law, it had beene in vaine for Ieſus Chriſt to counſell him to doe more then the Law: it had beene as much as if a man ſhould ſet vp the weather-cocke before the foundation be laid.

Ad Hilarium libr. 4. de quibuſdam ſacularibus.

ἐκεῖνος ὅτι ἀλλοτρίως ἔχει τῆς ἐντολῆς μάλιστα ὑπομένει. καὶ ψευδῆ σεαυτῷ μαρτυρήσας.

Ieſus Chriſt, that knew his heart was ſet vpon his riches, gaue him that commandement, thereby to diſcouer his auarice, and to checke him for the ſame. And it is not to bee doubted, that refuſing to do that which Ieſus Chriſt ſaid vnto him, he had not offended God. In that the Goſpell ſaith, that Ieſus Chriſt loued him, it doth not argue that he was without ſinne: for Ieſus loued Ieruſalem when he wept ouer it, and yet he accuſed it, that it had ſlaine the Prophets. And dying for ſinners, he ſhewed ſufficiently that he loued them. It was then a compaſſionate Loue that he ſhewed to that man, in whom he acknowledged ſome commendable indeauour, and ſome ſeeds of the feare of God.

THE XXIII. ARTICLE.

VVee beleeue that all the figures of the Law had an end at the comming of Ieſus Chriſt: yet howſoeuer the ceremonies are no more in vſe, the ſubſtance and truth thereof remaines vnto vs in the perſon of him in whom all accompliſhment conſiſteth. And beſides, we muſt vſe the vſe of the Law and the Prophets, as well to direct our liues, as to be conformable to the promiſes of the Goſpell.

THE XXIIII. ARTICLE.

We beleeue, that ſeeing Ieſus Chriſt is giuen vn to vs for our ſole Aduocate, and that hee commandeth vs to come with confidence vnto God the Father in his name, and that it is not lawfull for vs to pray, but according to that forme which God hath ſet down

vnto

vnto vs in his word, that all that which men haue imagined touching interceſſion of Saints that are dead, is nothing but an abuſe and a deceit of Satan, to make men erre out of the forme of praying well. We alſo reiect all other meanes, which men preſume vpon, thereby to redeeme themſelues before God, as derogating from the ſacrifice of the death and paſſion of Ieſus Chriſt. Laſtly, we hold Purgatory to be an illuſion proceeding out of the ſame ſhop, from whence alſo are proceeded Monaſticall vowes, pilgrimages, prohibition of marriage, and the vſe of meats, the ceremoniall obſeruation of dayes, auricular Confeſſion, Indulgences, and all other ſuch things, whereby men thinke to deſerue grace and ſaluation. Which things we reiect, not onely becauſe of the falſe opinion of merit which is ioyned vnto them, but alſo becauſe they are humane inuentions, which impoſe a yoke vpon mens conſciences.

Of Inuocation of Saints.

ARNOVX.

The Sonne of God is the onely Mediator, which maketh interceſſion for vs, and he alone it is, who ſpeaking for vs, cannot be denied or refuſed; and he onely, without whoſe mediation all others can preuaile nothing before God; and he onely that neuer ceaſſeth to intermediate for vs, & that by his onely and proper merits. But whither do they runne, which thinke or imagine that none others, but onely the Sonne of God, can implore the bounty and mercy of God by the merits of Chriſt: ſeeing they agree with vs, that wee may obtaine all whatſoeuer we aske for our ſelues in his Name, and that we ſhall not be denied for others? 71. Sect.

MOVLIN.

He ſpeakes according to his accuſtomed manner, which is, neuer to report the truth of our beliefe. We ſay nothing of all that which he maketh vs to ſay; we know well that others beſides Ieſus Chriſt may implore the bounty and mercy of God by the merits of Ieſus Chriſt.

ARNOVX.

72. Sect. *Why ſoeuer, or rather in this life then in the other, ſhall we haue this credit?*

MOVLIN.

This alſo makes vs ſay things farre differing from our beliefe. Our Confeſſion defineth not what we ſhall do in the life to come, nor whether we ſhall pray for thoſe that are liuing after vs vpon the earth. That is not our difference. The queſtion is, whether when we ſhall be in heauen, men that are on earth, ought to pray vnto and call vpon vs. It is one thing to enquire or to ſeeke to know, what the Saints doe in heauen, and another thing to know what we ſhould do here on earth. But *M. Arnoux* not vnderſtanding the queſtion, mixeth thoſe two things together which are much differing one from the other.

ARNOVX.

73. Sect. *Haue the Saints in heauen leſſe knowledge of our neceſſities, or leſſe charity then we?*

Whether the Saints vnderſtand our prayers, and all whatſoeuer is done vpon earth.

MOVLIN.

The Saints that are in heauen, haue more charitie then we, and more knowledge of thoſe things which belong or ſerue

ſerue to their bleſſednesse. But it is not neceſſary nor conuenient for their bleſſednesse, that they ſhould haue an exact knowledge of all particular things which are done here vpon earth, nor that they ſhould know euery proceſſe that is handled in Courts of Law, the troubles and buſineſſes in a Faire, or for how much euery oxe is ſold in a market. I ſpeake not of many filthy and diſhoneſt things: as alſo of diuers other things which might trouble their bleſſednesse: as if a father ſhould ſee the vices and afflictions of his children, one ſent to the gallowes, another vpon a ſcaffold to be executed, another caſt downe into hell, and another kneeling before an Image to pray vnto it.

The holy Scripture makes it euident vnto vs. *Salomon* in the 9. of Eccleſiaſtes, 5. 6. ſaith, that *the dead know not any thing, neither haue they any more a reward.* And a little after, *Neither haue they any more a portion for euer in any thing that is done vnder the Sunne* And Iob 14. 21. ſpeaking of a father that is dead, ſaith, *His ſonnes come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiueth it not.* And 2. Kings 22. 20. God promiſeth king *Ioſias* to let him go peaceably downe to his graue, that his eyes ſhould not ſee the euill which God intended to bring vpon the Iewes.

Againe: If the Saints vnderſtood our prayers, it is neceſſary that they ſhould know the imaginations of our hearts, to know whether we pray with a good affection. But the holy Scripture, 2. Chron. 6. 30. ſaith, that *God onely knowes the hearts of the children of men.* It is to no purpoſe to ſay that God onely of himſelfe knows the hearts of men, & that the Saints know them by reuelation: for beſides that this is to diuine and affirme a thing which is vnknowne vnto vs, and whereof the Scripture ſpeaketh not, in this diſtinction there is a contradiction. For they giue vs a reaſon why the Scripture ſaith, that the Saints know not our hearts, which is, becauſe God hath giuen them vnderſtanding to know them: they ſay, that they know not our thoughts, becauſe God hath made them know them. As if I ſhould ſay, I haue no money, becauſe you gaue me ſome. By the ſame reaſon I may ſay, that God

onely knowes that Ieſus Chriſt died for vs, becauſe hee knoweth it from and by himſelfe; but we know it not, but by reuelation. He that hath taught a thing to another man, cannot ſay that he onely knowes it. I confeſſe, that God ſometimes reueales the thoughts and counſels of ſome men, vnto his Prophets: but that knowledge was ſeldome giuen vnto the Prophets, and onely in as much as it was neceſſary for the execution of their charge. And 2. Kings 4. 47. *Eliſeus* ſaith, that God had hidden the death of his hoſteſſe the Sunamites ſonne from him; how much more the hearts of all men? and by conſequence, that cannot bee alledged for the Saints that are dead, to whom God hath not giuen any charge in the Church. For to ſay, that men giue the Saints charges and offices in Paradiſe, making one the protector of women in childbed, another a Phyſicion to heale the toothach, another to cure horſes, another Patron of a Towne or a whole Country, is a thing no leſſe abſurd, then if the flyes ſhould take vpon them to diſtribute and giue the charges and offices of the Empire of Rome, to whom they would.

And this may ſerue alſo for anſwer to the argument drawn from the example of the Angels, amongſt whom the Goſpell teacheth vs, there is ioy for the conuerſion of a ſinner, Luke 15. 10. God hath appointed the Angels to be gardians of the faithfull. Pſal. 34. 7. *The Angell of the Lord encampeth round about them that feare him, and deliuereth them*: and Heb. 1. 14. *They are miniſtring ſpirits, ſent forth to miniſter for their ſakes which ſhall be heires of ſaluation*. It is no maruell then, that God reuealeth vnto them the interior repentance of a ſinner, and that they reioyce at the effects thereof which appeare outwardly.

To thinke that the Angels and the Saints in the preſence of God know all things, or to ſay with Pope *Gregory* in the three and thirtieth chapter and fourth booke of his Dialogues, *What know not they there, where they know him which knoweth all things?* is to giue their raſh coniectures for lawes, and without the Word of God, to ſpeake of that which is done in heauen, as if they came newly from thence and

Quid eſt quod ibi neſciant, qui ſcientem omnia ſciunt?

and it is contrary to the Word of God. For Iesus Christ, Mat. 18. 10. saith, that *The Angels alwayes behold the face of the Father which is in heauen*: and yet they know not when the day of Iudgement shall be, Marke 13.32. By the publication of the Gospell they haue learned things, which before they knew not. For Saint *Paul*, Ephes. 3.10. speaking of the publication of the Gospell among the Gentiles, saith, that it was done, *to the intent that the manifold Wisdome of God might bee made knowne vnto principalities and powers in heauenly places.* Whereupon Saint *Peter* in his first Epistle, 1. 12. saith, that *The Angels desired to see those things*; as desiring to learne them.

Touching Pope *Gregories* words, they may well be borne withall, if he speake of the knowledge that the Saints haue of things belonging to their blessed state. But if he speake of a generall knowledge of all things, his words are as full of absurdity, as if one should say, that he which seeth *Philip*, necessarily seeth all that which *Philip* sees. If standing on the ground, I see a man vpō the top of a steeple, do I see all that which he seeth? If the sight of him that looketh, is to be measured according to the sight of him on whom he looketh, he that sees a blind man, shall see nothing at all.

To be short, to affirme that the knowledge of the Saints should be of the like extent that the sight of God is, it is to make the creature infinite. For first, it is necessary that the Saints (in that respect) should know the Infinity of Gods Essence, and in a finite spirit shou'd containe an infinite knowledge: and also that in a moment they should know all things: and that Saint *Nicholas* in an instant should see all the thoughts of men, and vnderstand all their prayers. Things which repugne the essence of creatures, whose essence as it consisteth in a currant for a time, so the actions thereof are successiue, and are done one after another, and not all in a moment. The ancient Fathers speake of the state of the Saints, and of the memory of things which they haue seene and knowne in this life, and of the knowledge which they haue had of things here below, sometimes with certainty,

tainty, and ſometimes doubtfully and vncertainly.

Saint *Hierome* [a] vpon the 65. chapter of *Eſay* ſaith, *It may be ſaid, that in the new heauen and in the new earth, all the memory of fore-paſſed conuerſation is defaced, leſt that the ſame might be an affliction vnto the Saints, to remember affliction paſt.* And in the Epitaph for *Nepotian* he ſaith: We know that our friend *Nepotian* is with Chriſt, and in the company of the Saints. And yet he ſaith that *Nepotian* neither ſaw nor vnderſtood that which was ſaid or done vpon the earth. [b] *All that I ſay in a manner is vaine, becauſe he heares it not. And let vs not ceaſſe to ſpeake of Nepotia, with whom we can ſpeake no more.* And, *Bleſſed Nepotian, which neither ſeeth nor heareth theſe things.*

Gregory Nazianzen in his oration maketh many Apoſtrophes, and ſundry oratory compellations, not onely to the Saints that are dead, but alſo to things without life. In his firſt Oration againſt *Iulian*, after he hath ſpoken to heauen and earth, he ſpeaketh alſo to the ſoule of *Conſtantine*, dead long before, ſaying [c] *Hearken, ô thou ſoule of great Conſtantine, if thou haſt any feeling*: not knowing whether he vnderſtood him or not. He ſpeaketh alſo with the ſame vncertainty of the ſoule of *Baſil*.

The booke of the ſpirit and the ſoule, attributed to Saint *Auguſtine*, in the [d] nine and twentieth chapter ſaith, that *the ſpirits of the dead are in a place where they neither ſee nor heare that which is done, nor what hapneth in this life vnto men. Neuertheleſſe, they haue a care of the liuing, although they know not by any meanes what they do, in the ſame manner that wee haue a care of the dead, although we know not what they do.* Yet he ſaith, that it may be that the dead know ſomething, that is done here on earth, by the report of thoſe which die here and go vnto them: or that the Angels tell them ſomewhat, or that God reuealeth ſomething vnto them, not all, but that onely which they muſt vnderſtand. Thus this Doctor diuineth, ſpeaking by coniectures onely, as men do when they ſpeake without the Word of God. All this is taken out of S. *Auguſtines* booke, of the care that we ought to haue of the dead,

[a] Licèt poſſet dici, quòd in cælo nouo, & in terra noua, omnis conuerſationis priſtinæ memoria delectur, ne hoc ipſum pars malorum ſit, prioris angu-ſtiæ recordari.

[b] Quicquid dixero quia ille non audit, multum videtur. Cum quo loqui non poſſumus, deos loqui non deſinamus. Felix Nepotianus qui hæc non videt, qui hæc non audit.

[c] ἄκουε χθὲ μεγάλου κεφαλῆς τινὸς ψυχῆς εἴ τίς ἄδηλος.

[d] Ibi quidem ſunt ſpiritus defunctorum, vbi non vident neque audiunt quæ aguntur, aut eueniunt in iſta vita hominibus. Ita tamen eſt eis cura de viuis, quanquam quid agunt omnino neſci-

dead, where he holds for an assured opinion, that if the dead knew what is done here, his good mother *Monicha* would not haue forgotten him.

aut, quemadmodum eſt rogare vt̃ hic curet de matris ſuæ vitis quid agunt vtiq; neſciamus.

There are diuers places found in *Chryſoſtome*, wherein hee saith, that the Saints do not yet enioy celestiall glory; and others wherein he saith that they doe enioy it. And there are some places found in him, wherein he seemeth to approue the inuocation of Saints, and others in much greater number, wherein he condemneth it. Which is a proofe, that of malice some places haue beene thrust into the writings of that holy man.

Whether Iesus Christ is our onely Mediator and Aduocate.

ARNOVX.

Places of the Scripture set downe in the margent of the Confession. 1. *Tim.* 2. 5. *For there is one onely God, and one onely mediator betweene God and man, which is the Man Iesus Christ, who gaue himselfe a ransome for all men.* 74. Sect.

In this place the word Aduocate *is not there, and the word* Mediator *is an equiuocation, for that it may be taken for a Mediator of intercession, and for a mediator of redemption. Besides this, the text in the Ministers Bible is false: for in the Greeke, (which is the originall,) the word* onely *is not there.*

MOVLIN.

The word *Aduocate* is not in the place of the 1. to Tim. but it is found in 1. Ioh. chapter 2. verse 1. *If any man sinne, we haue an Aduocate with the Father, Iesus Christ the Iust.* It is from thence that our Confession hath taken the word *Aduocate*. And if the word were not there, yet by the word Aduocate we vnderstand nothing but a Mediator, which is the very word vsed by Saint *Paul*. Touching that which *Master Arnoux* saith, that the word *mediator* is an equiuocation, hee accuseth Saint *Paul* to haue equiuocated. He saith, that the word *mediator* may be taken for a mediator of intercession,

or

or for a mediator of redemption. But the coupling of theſe together, *God is one, and the Mediator is one*, confuteth this diſtinctiõ. For as the Apoſtle maketh not two ſorts of Gods, ſo he alloweth not of two ſorts of mediators towards God. If it be lawfull to make diſtinctiõs vpon the word *Mediator*, why not vpon the word *God*, and ſo to induce diuers Gods? For although we do not deny that the Saints pray for vs, yet they are not called mediators of interceſſion, becauſe we call him the Mediator of interceſſion, that receiueth our prayers to preſent them vnto God: which the Saints cannot do, becauſe they vnderſtand not our prayers, as we haue already proued.

Adde hereunto, that this diſtinction maketh the Saints to be but mediators of interceſſion, contrary to the Church of Rome, which beleeueth that the Saints do not onely mediate for vs, but alſo pay, merit, and ſatisfie for vs. Witneſſe the doctrine of Indulgences or pardons, by the which the Pope diſtributeth vnto Chriſtians the ſuperabundance of the ſatisfactions of the Saints, to ſerue them to obtaine remiſſion of ſins before God. Witneſſe alſo the Maſſe, which asketh ſaluation of God by the merits of the Saints, as if they had merited for vs. Whereupon *Bellarmine* alſo in his firſt booke and fourth chapter of Indulgences, makes no difficulty to ſay, that *the Saints in ſome ſort are our redeemers.*

Quorum meritis precibuſq; rogamus, &c.

Now for the imputation laid on vs, to haue falſified this place, and to haue put in our text, one onely God, and one onely Mediator, otherwiſe then it is in the Greeke, where the word *onely* is not found, this accuſation argues, that our Aduerſary either hath no vnderſtanding in the Greeke, or elſe that he hath no conſcience. According to the Greeke, it is thus, *There is one God, and one Mediator.* Is not that as much to ſay, as *There is one onely God, and one onely mediator?* And whē we tranſlate, *There is one onely God*, our aduerſaries diſlike it not; but when in the words following we tranſlate, *There is one onely Mediator*, they accuſe vs of falſhood; and yet the manner of ſpeaking is all one in the Greeke, and in the ſame line. The French Bible tranſlated by the Doctors of Louain inſtifieth vs therein; for in the third Chapter of the ſame

εἷς θεὸς, εἷς μεσίτης

Epiſtle

Epistle, ver. 2. VVhere there is *vnius vxoris virum*, they haue trãslated *the husband of one only Wife*, because that *vs* in Greek, as also *vnus* in Latin, is as much as alone, and by consequence onely.

The ancient Doctors did not reiect this word *alone* in this matter. [a] *Tertullian* in the thirtieth Chapter of his Apologie, saith, *We cannot aske these things of any other but of him, of whom I know I shall obtaine them. For also it is he onely which granteth it, and I am he who am to be heard, that am his seruant, which call vpon him onely.*

Origen in his eight Tome against *Celsus*, saith, [b] *We must pray to none, but to God onely for all things, and to his onely Sonne.*

Saint *Ambrose* in his oration vpon the death of *Theodosius*, correcting that which he had said in the booke of Widowes, made when he first began to be a Christian: [c] *Thou neuertheless, O Lord, oughtest onely to be called vpon, and praied vnto.*

As touching making Saints our mediators, S. *Augustine* in many places is expresly against it: in his two and twentieth Treatise vpon Saint *Iohn*, *That is it which thy Sauiour saith, Thou hast no where to go but vnto me, thou canst not go but by me.*

And in his Epistle against *Parmenian* he saith, *If Saint Paul was a mediator, so should all the other Apostles be mediators; and so there should be diuers mediators: and Saint Paul also should haue mistaken himselfe, in saying that there is but one God and one Mediator.* Now ye must note, that in that Chapter hee speakes but of a mediator of intercession, for he disputed against *Parmenian*, that he had called the Bishop mediator betweene God and man.

And in the first Treatise vpon the first Epistle of Saint Iohn the second Chapter, vpon these words of Saint *Iohn*, *We haue an Aduocate with our Father*; he saith thus: *This great person saith not, You haue an Aduocate with the Father, but, If any man hath sinned, we haue an Aduocate with the Father*; hee saith not, *You haue*, nor also, *You haue me*, nor, *You haue Christ*:

[a] *Ipse qui solus præstat & ego sum cui impetrare debetur, famulum eius qui eum solum obsecro.*

[b] μόνῳ προσευκτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ καὶ μονογενεῖ

[c] *Sed tamen tu solus Domine inuocandus es.*

[d] *Non est quo eas nisi ad me, non est quo eas nisi per me.* Lib. 2. cap. 8. *Nam si esset mediator Paulus, essent vtique & cæteri apostoli, ac sic multi mediatores essent; nec ipsi Paulo constaret ratio qua dixerat, vnus Deus vnus Mediator.*

[e] *Non dixit habetis, nec me habetis dixit, nec ipsi Christum habetis dixit, sed Christum posuit, non se: & hæc homus dixit, non habetis. Noluit se ponere in nomen aduocationis.*

ro peccatorum vt haberet aduocatum Christum, quam ponere se pro Christo

but

but he hath put Christ, and not himselfe, and hath said, We haue, and not, You haue: he chose rather to put himselfe into the number of sinners, that he might haue Christ for an Aduocate, then to put himselfe for an Aduocate instead of Christ, and so to be found among the proud and damned crue.

Among ancient writers there are some places found which speake of the intercession of the Saints. There are also wishes found that were made by liuing men, that the Saints would pray for them: but we haue already said, that our difference is not, whether the Saints pray for vs, but whether we must pray vnto and call vpon them. And although that in ancient writers there are found examples of particular persons, who by a disordered deuotion called vpon the Saints, yet it is but of late time, that the inuocation of Saints is put into the common Seruice, and is established by lawes and rules of Councels.

Concil. Carthag. 3. Can. 23. Cum ad altare assistetur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio.

But alwayes they are such men that speake, in whom our Aduersaries themselues note diuers errours: and therefore their allegation makes rather against, then for the inuocation of Saints. Hauing the holy Scripture for vs, it sufficeth vs; wherein our Aduersaries themselues confesse, that the inuocation of Saints is not commanded: and now they beginne to say, that it is not necessary, contradicting Pope *Innocent* the third, who in the third booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, chapter 9. saith, That *the Suffrages of the Saints are necessarie for vs, as long as we are in the way.*

Necessarium nobis est in via sanctorum suffragium.

ARNOVX.

75. Sect. *Iohn* 1 *Epistle* 2. 1. *If any man sinne, we haue an Aduocate with the Father, Iesus Christ the Iust, and he is the reconciliation for our sinnes.*

He saith not, that we haue but one Aduocate, he is farre from that. But speaking of the excellency of the Aduocate, without whom all the other are not to be receiued, he saith, We haue an Aduocate, without excluding others.

That the Saints are not our Aduocates, and that the Church of Rome inuocateth diuers Saints that neuer were, and whoſe holineſſe is very queſtionable.

MOVLIN.

Whoſoeuer knoweth what it is to be an Aduocate with God, knoweth alſo that the ſame title belongeth not vnto the Saints. He is an Aduocate with God for vs, who receiueth our prayers, and preſenteth our requeſts to God, and accompanieth them with his interceſſiō. The Saints vnderſtand not our prayers, as we haue already proued, and by conſequence cannot preſent them vnto God: and though they vnderſtood our prayers, God hath receiued them, before the Saints haue any leaſure to ioyne their recommendations thereto. And in the ſame place, Saint *Iohn* hauing ſaid that we haue an Aduocate with God, addeth, *For it is he which is the reconciliation for our ſinnes*: Shewing how he is our Aduocate; to wit, becauſe he maketh reconciliation for our ſinnes. Then to be an Aduocate for ſinners, is to be their reconciliator; and if Ieſus Chriſt be our onely reconciliator, then alſo he is our only Aduocate.

Our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt decideth the queſtion in plaine words, Iohn 14. 6. ſaying, *I am the way, the truth, and the life, no man commeth to the Father but by me.* Then not by the Saints, nor by the interceſſion of creatures.

If the Saints be aduocates in heauen, who hath made them ſuch? who hath receiued them for ſuch? who commanded vs to pray vnto them? Haue children any need to vſe interceſſors for them to ſpeake vnto their father? And ſeeing that God frames and inſpires our prayers, muſt we haue interceſſors to recommend that prayer vnto God, which he himſelfe hath put into our hearts and mouthes? If I preſent my prayer vnto God by the interceſſion of Ieſus Chriſt onely, ſhall my prayers

prayer be leſſe acceptable vnto God, then if I had employed the Saints to make interceſſion for me?

If we throughly conſider of this matter, it will bee found that our aduerſaries ſeeking to go to God by the interceſſion of the Saints, draw mens ſpirits into an endleſſe Labyrinth. For they ſay, they go to God by meanes of the Saints, but in effect they go to the Saints by Gods meanes: for they confeſſe that God reuealeth our prayers to the Saints. Then they bring in God aduiſing the Saints, as if he ſhould ſay to Saint *Francis*, *Bleſſed Saint, know that ſuch an one that liues below in the earth in ſuch a place, asketh ſuch and ſuch things of thee, whereof I tell thee, to the end that thou ſhouldeſt pray vnto me for him, and then I will take aduice, whether I will heare thee or not.* Which is an hatching of goodly conceptions, which make God mediator to the Saints, rather the Saints mediators to God.

Now if by the Saints we go to Ieſus Chriſt, and if they bee mediators to the Mediator, the prayers that we ſhall make to the Saints, ſhall firſt go to God, and from God to the Saints, and from the Saints to Ieſus Chriſt, and from Ieſus Chriſt to God. A man that is in danger of drowning, may ſinke foure times at the leaſt, before his prayer ſhall haue paſſed thorow ſo many hands.

And yet there is ſome difficultie: for before we make the Saints our mediators, we muſt be well aſſured that they are Saints. Now the Church of Rome calleth vpon many Saints that neuer liued in the world, and many whoſe bleſſedneſſe may iuſtly be called in queſtion.

The three Kings, Saint *Longius* that pierced Chriſts ſide: Saint *Martiall* couſin to S. *Peter*, that waited on the table, when Ieſus Chriſt celebrated the Euchariſt, that draue Pagan religion out of France in the time of the Gothes when there were no Gothes in France: Saint *Vrſula* daughter to the King of England (when there was no King in England) captaine of an army of eleuen thouſand Virgins: Sant *Katherine* daughter to *Coſtus* King of Alexandria, when there was no King in Alexandria, who in the Emperour *Maxentius* time

time, conuerted Queene *Faustina* and fifty Philosophers, are Persons that neuer liued in the world, as we may easily proue, and whose liues (by *Baronius* confession in his booke of Martyrs) are stuffed with a number of fables. The witnesses which they produce for their liues, are *Vsuard*, *Simeon Metaphrastus*, *Molanus Euthymius*, the Calendar of the Grecians, and such new fabulous authors, which *Baronius* wholly contradicts. But no good ancient authour who liued fiue hundred yeeres after the time which is named, wherein they say these imagined Saints should liue, doth speake of them. *Baronius* maketh account that Saint *George* and Saint *Christopher* are symbolicall pictures, in the same sort that we paint the Vertues: and yet men call vpon these Saints; and it is found that Saint *George* was an Arian Bishop, enemy to *Athanasius*. The like of Saint *Margaret*, whom the diuell swallowed downe into his belly, and burst therewith, which is a kind of lying in childbed, and therefore they reade her Legend to women lying in childbed. They make these Saints o liue vnder kings that neuer were, and in a time and in a countrey wherein there were no Martyrs, nor the name of Christianitie knowne. They begin to be borne fixe or seuen hundred yeeres after they died. There are a thousand absurd and ridiculous actions attributed vnto them. A man should sooner make cleane *Augias* stable, then cleare the liues of these Saints of fabulous tales.

Adde to these imagined Saints, the Saints which the Popes canonize, and place in the role of Saints, commanding the Church of Rome to call vpon them, & attribute an holy day vnto them. An innouation, whereof there is not one footstep to be found in all antiquity. The cause is pleaded in the Popes Consistory, and sometimes it happeneth that the Saint for whom they pleade loseth his cause, and hath not men that pleade well for him: sometimes he partly wins his cause, and is declared to be blessed, which is a degree to sanctification: in so much that many Saints are much bound and beholding to the Popes. And the booke of Sacred Ceremonies saith, that sometimes it happeneth that the Pope is constrained to

Lib. 1. Sacr. Cerem. Sect. 6. cap. 1. Papa tunc quodammodo cogebatur ad canonizandam quendam contra suam opinionem, & propterea protestabatur.

canonize some Saints against his will; and that, for that cause at this day he yet maketh protestation to discharge his conscience. * The Popes, *Innocent* the third, and *Alexander* the third, forbid calling vpon any Saints without the Popes approbation. But how many Saints are called vpon, of whose holinesse the Pope neuer made declaration, and of whom he neuer heard speaking?

* *Cap. 1. & 2. de reliquijs & sanctorum inuocatione.*

To acknowledge those for Saints with certainty of faith, a man must be of a very light beleefe: seeing that all those which say that the Pope cannot erre in faith, confesse that he may erre in matter of fact, and that he may be deceiued. Now the canonization is made at the solicitation of Princes, or of Prelates, or of Commonwealths, with manifest dealing vnderhand, and dependeth vpon the honesty and vertue of him that is canonized; which is a question which consisteth vpon information, wherein men may vse deceit and false witnesse, because thereon depends the profit and aduantage to some towne or village, by the assembling and repairing of people to visit a new Saint, who presently doth miracles.

Chap. 26. of the first book of the institution.

Touching this matter, *Cotton* the Iesuite saith, *that to doubt that those whom the vicar of Iesus Christ hath declared to be blessed, are not Saints, it is to make a challenge against the booke of life, to oppose against the manifestation of the booke of Predestination, and to belie the booke with seuen seales which was opened by the Lambe.* Words which he placeth rather to make ostentation of his high conceits, then for any beleefe that he hath of that which he saith. For a man must be a flatterer in the highest degree, to make the Pope beleeue that the role of his Canonizations is the Booke of life, or the booke sealed with seuen seales, whereof there is mention, Apocalips 5. 1. And it is hardly to be thought, that the Pope should be assured of another mans predestination, seeing he is not assured of his owne: there being so many Popes which our aduersaries themselues say are damned. By this meanes a man registred among the damned, puts whom he will among the Saints.

Experience manifestly sheweth it: for the Popes often-

times

times put not those into the role of Saints that haue most conformed their lines according to the will of God, but those that supported and aduanced the Papall Empire, as *Thomas* of Canterbury, and *Anselmus*, who suffered not for the defence of any of the Articles of the Christian faith, but for the Inuestitures & other rights & temporall profits which the Pope attributed to himselfe in England. From this Spring it floweth, that those that haue sought to kill and to murther kings, are at this day put into the role of Martyrs. By this meanes Saint *Dominicke* became a Saint, who for the maintenance of the Papacy caused diuers thousands of good Christians to be massacred, * preaching the croysado to roote out the true faithfull people, which then were iniuriously termed Albigenses, in the same manner as we are called Huguenots, because we receiue not, nor allow of any other doctrine then that of Iesus Christ and the Apostles. This is that Saint which Saint *Antonius* Archbishop of Florence compared with Iesus Christ, and found but very little inequalitie betweene him and Iesus Christ.

* *Antonius Archiep. Flor. Part. 3. Tit. 23. in vita Catharinæ Senensis. Pater Dominicus in adiutorium sumpsit quasdam deuotas personas zelantes pro fide, quæ corporaliter illos hæreticos gladio materiali expugnarent. 76. Sect.*

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. Iames 5. 14. Is any sicke among you, let him call for the Priests of the Church, and let them pray for him. And 16. Pray one for another, that you may be healed, Coloss. 1. 3. We giue all thanks for you vnto God, which is the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ, alwayes praying for you.

Here are diuers aduocates: Then Iesus Christ is not giuen vnto vs for our onely Aduocate: and if praying here on earth one for another, do no way preiudice his office of Aduocate, how and wherefore should the Saints praying in heauen, diminish the glory of his intercession? But rather is it not greater, seeing that all their prayers are grounded vpon his merit?

That the mutuall prayers of the liuing, praying one for another, makes nothing for inuocation of Saints that are dead.

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux will proue, that the Saints pray for vs in heauen, which is not in controuerſie between vs. The Saints may pray generally for the Church, without knowing the thoughts and the neceſſities of particular perſons.

But let vs ſee how he proues it. He produceth three places out of the Scripture, which ſpeak of the prayers which the liuing make one for another. Which is nothing to the purpoſe. For here the queſtion is not touching the prayers of the liuing, which God hath commanded to be made, & which are made by thoſe which particularly and mutually know our neceſſities. But the queſtion is here touching the prayers which the Saints that are dead make for the liuing, whoſe particular neceſſities they know not, and we know not what commandement God hath giuen them touching the ſame. Moreouer when we recommend our ſelues to the mutuall prayers of the faithfull one for another, it is a reciprocall dutie among vs, which is not ſo betweene vs and the Saints.

And withall, when we pray our neighbours to pray for vs, we do no religious ſeruice vnto them. We kneele not downe before them in the Church. We do not acknowledge them to be the ſearchers of our hearts. We eſteeme them not to be our Patrons or gardians. We light not vp candles before them. We are well aſſured that they vnderſtand vs when we ſpeake vnto them. To be ſhort, the prayers of the liuing one for another, hath no affinitie with the interceſſion and calling vpon dead Saints.

If a man ſhould aske whether the liuing praying one for another, may be called aduocates with God? I ſay, that the Word of God giues them not that title, to the language or ſpeech whereof it is requiſite for vs to be conformable. It giueth that title to Ieſus Chriſt onely, becauſe that to be a mans aduocate, he muſt exactly know the cauſe, and the depth of a mans griefe: & muſt not only intreate the Iudge for the party, but alſo debate and defend his parties cauſe to be iuſt and well grounded. Now there is none but Ieſus Chriſt to whom this appertaineth. For men praying one for another, do

not

not well know the ground of their neighbours griefe, becauſe they know not their hearts, nor the nature and greatneſſe of their ſinnes, nor their repentance. And they cannot argue with God touching our cauſe, becauſe they haue nothing to ſatisfie & pay for vs: their prayer for vs is a ſimple ſupplication, and not an action of an Aduocate. There is no body but Ieſus Chriſt, who pleading our cauſe, can confute the diuels accuſations, which is that accuſer ſpoken of in the twelft of the Reuelation, which accuſeth vs day and night before God.

Of the credit and reputation of the Saints in heauen.

ARNOVX.

In the ſame Article ſomewhat lower. All that which men haue imagined of the Saints that are dead, is but an abuſe and a deceit of Satan. 77. Sect.

They thinke to make a ſacrifice of prayſe to Ieſus Chriſt, by giuing him credit (as they ſuppoſe) by the excluding of all his ſeruants, which ſhould be hardly welcome vnto heauen, and but meanely entertained, if they had loſt the credit they had vpon earth.

MOVLIN.

The queſtion betweene vs and our aduerſaries is twofold; one, whether the Saints know our hearts; the other, whether we muſt call vpon, and pray vnto them. Theſe two queſtions *M. Arnoux* toucheth not, but moueth a third which is not in controuerſie, to know whether the Saints pray for vs in heauen.

This diſcourſe, although from the purpoſe, is neuertheleſſe ſtuffed with prety conceits. He ſaith, that the Saints *ſhould be hardly welcome into heauen, and but meanely entertained, if they haue loſt the credit that they had vpon earth.* This diuinitie is delicate, and ſerues but for thoſe that are of generous ſpirits, whereby he placeth Saints in Paradiſe,

that are not welcome thither. For it is certaine, that there are many Saints in Paradiſe that are vnknowne to vs; and many that hauing liued holily, haue been forgotten or elſe defamed after their deaths. So that it reſteth in the power of the liuing to make a Saint either well or ill entertained in heauen, if men be not carefull to ſerue them, and do preſently forget them. It is maruell then that ſuch a Saint is ſuffered to enter into Paradiſe, and that the gate is not ſhut againſt him, ſeeing he can ſtand God in no ſtead with his credit on earth. For Saint *Peter* at the gate might aske him, What account art thou of on earth? haſt thou any credit in thy countrey? For God hath need of Saints that are of credit among men. What ſhould Saints do in Paradiſe, to whom men burne no tapers on earth? Yet *M. Arnoux* will haue thoſe Saints to enter therein, but to be hardly welcome thither, and to receiue a diſgrace at their entring into heauen. Therefore we haue reaſon to pitie *Abraham*, *Moſes*, and *Dauid*, whoſe credits are exceedingly diminiſhed, in ſo much that he ſhould be laughed at that ſhould ſay, Saint *Moſes*, or Saint *Abraham*. They paſſe onely in the preaſe among the Patriarkes. No man makes any particular prayer vnto them. No man lights the leaſt waxe candle that is, before *Abraham* the father of the faithfull. They ſpeake of Saint *Geneueffes* & Saint *Anthonies* Maſſes, but not of Saint *Moſes* nor of Saint *Abrahams* Maſſes. And euery Saint hath his charge, one of a ſickneſſe, another of a towne: but *Moſes* and *Abraham* neuer receiued any charge or commiſſion from men. This alſo is iniurious againſt the Popes. For I ſee not that *Innocent* the fourth, *Boniface* the eighth, nor *Alexander* the ſixt, which were great men on earth, keepe their credit after their death: Therefore they are hardly welcome into heauen, and were but meanly entertained there.

Yet *M. Arnoux* ſhou'd be borne withall, for that by a recreatiue dexteritie he likeneth or compareth the kingdome of heauen to the formes and complements of the Courts of Popes and Kings. From thence it proceedeth that the Papiſts dreſſe God the Father like the Pope. From hence it cõmeth

that

that father *Conteri* called Ieſus Chriſt the Dolphin of heauen. And that the Ieſuite *Barradius* made that goodly obſeruation, after *Anſelmus*, who asked of Ieſus Chriſt, Why he tooke not his mother with him when he aſcended vp into heauen? The anſwer is, *It may be, Lord, for feare leſt thy heauenly Court ſhould be in doubt which of the two they ſhould go to meete firſt, whether thee their Lord, or her which is their Lady.* It was well then aduiſed of him, to leaue her behind him on earth. But leſt any man of an hard beliefe might doubt that which is ſaid before, the Ieſuite brings forth *Ariſtotle* to helpe him.

Barradius in Concordiam Euangelicam. Tom. 1. lib. 6. c. 11. Fortaſſis Domine, ne tuæ cœleſti curiæ veniret in dubium cui potius occurreret, tibi Domino ſuo, an ipſi Dominæ ſuæ.

Proofe of Inuocation of Saints by Ariſtotle.

ARNOVX.

Theſe ſeruants of God ſhould be deprined of one part of humane felicitie, which conſiſteth, (as Ariſtotle noteth in his Morals,) in the care and remembrance which the ſoules of the dead ſhould haue of their friends which they leaue vpon the earth. 78. Sect.

MOVLIN.

The place in *Ariſtotle* which he alledgeth, is in the firſt of his Ethickes, 11. chapter: where there is nothing of all that which *M. Arnoux* makes him ſay. For in all that chapter, *Ariſtotle* diſputeth whether the affaires of the liuing touch or concerne their parents and friends dead, whereof he ſpeaketh with ſuch vncertainty that he ſaith, *that it is to be doubted whether the dead haue any feeling or participation either of good or euill*: and in the end concludeth like a man that had no ſight therein at all, That if the affaires of the liuing concerne the dead, it is very little, and not of force to alter their beatitude. This place therefore is falſly alledged. It was ill aduiſed of him to take on him to teach vs what the bleſſednesse and knowledge of the Saints in heauen is, by the coniectures of an heathen Philoſopher; & much more, to imagine that a part of the felicitie of the Saints conſiſteth in hauing a

μαλλον δ' ἴσως διαπορῆσαι ἄν τις εἰ τοὺς κεκμηκότας ἐπιμελείας τινὸς καὶ φροντίδος ἀγαθῆς κεκοινώνηκεν, ἢ οὔ· ἀντικειμένων

M. Arnoux falſification.

remembrance of their friends that they left behind them vpon earth. For if the remembrance of their prosperitie and vertue augmenteth the blessednesse of the Saints that are in heauen, the remembrance of their aduersities, and of their vices will also diminish their felicity. Yet this doth not stretch the care and the knowledge of the Saints, but vnto those whom they knew here vpon earth, and left behind them liuing in the world, which is a restraining of their knowledge into very streight limits.

ARNOVX.

79. Sect. *Places of Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confession, Acts 10. 25. and 26. where it is said, that Cornelius meeting Peter, Peter lifted him vp, saying, Stand vp, for I am a man.*

MOVLIN.

A place of Scripture cut off in the middle by M. Arnoux. This place is set downe in the margent of our Confession, to confute all the religious seruice and adoration that men giue to creatures: which if *M. Arnoux* had not cited by halues, and had not taken away the words wherein the force of that place cõsisteth, euery man might haue perceiued how fitly it was alledged. Thus the text hath it: *As Peter came in, Cornelius met him, and falling downe at his feete, worshipped him, but Peter tooke him vp, saying, For euen I my selfe am a man.* *M. Arnoux* hath cut off these words, *he fell downe at his feete and worshipped him.* And see here the like falsification.

ARNOVX.

80. Sect. *And Acts 14. 15. Paul and Barnabas said, Men, why do ye these things? we also are men subiect to the same condition.*

MOVLIN.

A place of Scripture cut in the middle by M. Arnoux. You omit that which is said a little before, that they of *Lystra* would haue offered sacrifice to *Barnabas* and *Paul*, as if they had bene gods: which the said Apostles would not suffer them to do.

AR-

ARNOVX.

And Apocalips 19. 10. And I fell before his feet to worship him, but he said to me, See thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant, worship God. 81. Sect.

All these three places teach, that we must not giue vnto creatures that worship which belongs vnto God, nor to liuing men, the honour which we owe vnto the Saints that already enioy their glory. Where then is Satans deceit, in the adoration of Saints?

Confutation of the Inuocation of Saints by the holy Scriptures.

MOVLIN.

Our Confession condemneth the intercession of Saints, that is, it condemneth those which employ them for Intercessors, and pray them to be Intercessors for them: which prayer is a religious worship. Now the Church of Rome commandeth the adoration of Saints and their reliques, but setteth downe distinctions of adoration, one proper to God, which they cal *Latria*, the other (which is referred to Saints) they call *Dulia*; which are both religious worships, and an act of religion. For the inuocation of Saints which is vsed in the Church of Rome, is a part of the publike Seruice; and whē men pray kneeling before their Images, they haue their recourse vnto them as to those to whom men owe a religious seruice, that know their hearts, and that haue power to heare them.

Against this abuse our Confession quoteth these three places of Scripture, wherein are condemned, the worship which *Cornelius* would haue giuen to *Peter*, that which the Lystrians would haue giuen to *Paul*, and that which *Iohn* would haue giuen to the Angell. In which places there is no mention made of two sorts of worshipping, but generally all religious worshipping of creatures is forbidden. And withall there is no apparence, that *Cornelius*, a man which feared God,

God, was ſo dull to thinke Saint *Peter* to be the ſoueraigne God, or that an equall honour (due to the ſoueraigne God) belonged vnto him. Touching Saint *Iohn*, that would haue adored the Angell that ſpake vnto him, for the which the Angell rebuked him, ſaying, *Take heed thou do it not, I am thy fellow ſeruant, worſhip God:* you muſt know, that twice Saint *Iohn* would haue worſhipped the Angell, one Reuel. 19. 10. the other 22. 9. and that after the firſt time that the Angell rebuked him, ſaying, *Worſhip God, I am thy fellow ſeruant*, it is an euident proofe, that the ſecond time when Saint *Iohn* would haue worſhipped him, he knew well that it was not God, ſeeing the Angell told him ſo before: but being afraid, he would haue giuen him ſome inferiour worſhip, which neuertheleſſe the Angell refuſed. If that Angell had been a Romiſh Catholicke, he would haue ſpoken to Saint *Iohn* in this manner: *The worſhip which thou giueſt me, is too high for me, I will be content with a meaner worſhip, and an adoration of Dulia: for that of Latria belongeth onely vnto God.* But that Angell had not learned ſo farre. So when the Orthodoxe Diuines called the Arrians Idolaters, becauſe they worſhipped Ieſus Chriſt, whom they held to be but a creature; the Arrians might well haue excuſed themſelues, by ſaying that they worſhipped Ieſus Chriſt with an inferiour worſhip. But then they acknowledged but one religious worſhip, and that due to God onely.

Reade Athanaſius in the life of S. Anthony.

2 Saint *Iames* the Apoſtle, 1. 6. will haue vs *to pray in faith and wauer not.* Now the prayer made to Saints cannot be made in faith, ſeeing that God hath not commanded it in his Word. *For faith is by hearing of the Word of God*, Rom. 10. 17. But that prayer vnto Saints is not commanded in the Word of God, *M. Cotton* the Ieſuite in the firſt booke of his Inſtitution, in the chapter of Inuocation of Saints, confeſſeth it, ſaying: *Touching a commandement to pray vnto, and to call vpon the Saints, the Church neuer taught that there was euer any ſuch commandement.* Then if it be not a commandement of God, it is a commandement of men: ſeeing that in the publicke Seruice of the Romiſh Church, and in the Letanies, the

Saints

Saints are called vpon, the people are bound thereunto, and it is not in any particular mans power to diſpenſe with himſelfe therein.

3 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, Rom. 10. 14. maintaineth, that we cannot call vpon any other then on him in whom we beleeue, ſaying; *How ſhall they call on him in whom they haue not beleeued?* Our Creed teacheth vs to beleeue in God, Father, Sonne, and holy Ghoſt. And Ioh. 14. 1. *You beleeue in God, beleeue alſo in me.* Then it is manifeſt, that Saint *Paul* without exception reproueth all inuocation of creatures. And if any man will induce a ſecond religious inuocation, he ought to proue it by the Word of God.

4 The ſame Apoſtle, Galat. 4. 8. ſaith, *Then when ye knew not God, ye did ſeruice vnto them which by nature are not gods.* The Church of Rome ſeruing Saints & Angels, ſerueth thoſe who by their nature are no gods. Now it is to be noted, that in the Greeke there is δουλεύσατε, that is to ſay, *you giue Dulia*, which is the ſeruice which the Church of Rome giueth vnto Saints. The Apoſtle reproueth the Galatians for giuing Dulia to any other but to God.

5 The Scripture is full of places which command vs to addreſſe all our prayers vnto God. The Apoſtles deſired Ieſus Chriſt, ſaying, *Teach vs to pray*: and he ſaid vnto them, *When ye pray, ſay, Our Father which art in heauen.* We muſt teach this leſſon to thoſe that pray vnto Saints, and ſay vnto them, *When you pray, ſay, Our Father which art in heauen.* God in the Pſalme 50. 15. ſaith, *Call vpon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliuer thee*: and in the ſame Pſalme, verſe 14. *Offer vnto God thankſgiuing, and pay thy vowes vnto the moſt High.* How many are there in the Church of Rome, that make vowes to Saints, or that vow to go on pilgrimage to them, or to offer vnto thē? Deut. 6. 13. *Thou ſhalt feare the Lord thy God, and ſerue him, and ſhalt ſweare by his Name.* The Catechiſme of the Councel of Trent teacheth the contrarie, ſaying, We ſweare by the croſſe, by relickes, and by the names of Saints. To ſweare by any one, is to acknowledge him to be a witneſſe of the integrity of our conſciences, and a reuenger of periury; which agreeth

Luke 11. 1, 2.

In the expoſition of the third Commandement.

agreeth not with relickes. To ſay, that ſwearing by the relickes of Saints, we ſweare by God that loueth the Saints, is to accuſe the Prophets & the Apoſtles herein, that knowing well, that God loued *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Iacob*, they did not ſweare by their relickes. By the ſame reaſon I might worſhip the Sonne, and ſweare by heauen, and ſay, that I do it to honour God that made it.

6 Ieſus Chriſt, Matthew 4. 10. ſaid to Satan, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou ſerue:* thereby confuting Satan, that offered him all the kingdomes of the world if he would worſhip him. Who doubts not but that Satan would haue bene content with an inferiour worſhip? Our Sauiour might haue confuted Satan, either by the dignitie of his perſon, as being the Sonne of God, or by the indignity of Satan, as being the principall ſlaue of hell. But he choſe rather to ſend him to that rule whereby all adoration of creatures is forbidden.

7 But ſeeing that our aduerſaries make two ſorts of good workes, one commanded by God, the other onely counſelled, and perfecter then thoſe that are commanded, I would gladly know in what place they put the inuocation of Saints. For ſeeing that our aduerſaries do acknowledge that God hath not commanded it, to be a good worke it muſt be counſelled, and by conſequence the inuocation of Saints is a perfecter worke then calling vpon God. In the meane time there is no man ſo brutiſhly ſuperſtitious, that ſeeing two mē kneeling on their knees, whereof the one prayeth vnto God, the other to Saint *Francis*, but will confeſſe, that he which prayeth vnto God, doth a better worke then the other.

8 Particularly for the inuocation and ſeruice of Angels, we haue an expreſſe paſſage of the Apoſtle, Coloſſians 2. 18. *Let no man at his pleaſure beare rule ouer you by humbleneſſe of minde, and worſhipping of Angels, infinuating himſelfe into thoſe things which he neuer ſaw.* Let men as much as they will diuine the meaning of Saint *Paul* in this place, yet it is certaine, that he generally prohibiteth the ſeruice of Angels, and by conſequence that which is practiſed in the Church of Rome.

Rome. And in the Church of the old Teſtament, when Angels appeared vnto men, and viſibly did thoſe meſſages and commiſſions wherein God employed them, yet the faithfull neuer did ordaine any religious ſeruice to be done vnto them. In all the publike Seruice preſcribed in the bookes of *Moſes*, there is nothing ſpoken of any ſeruice done to Angels in the Tabernacle. And I would gladly know why now, when their ayde is leſſe ſenſible, they ought rather to be ſerued and called vpon? *Theodoret* in his commentarie vpon this place, ſaith, *Thoſe that forbad the Law, brought in this ſeruing of Angels, ſaying, that the Law was giuen by their interpoſition. This vice continued a long time among them of Phrygia and Piſidia. Therefore the Synod aſſembled in Laodicea the capitall Citie of Phrygia, by expreſſe ordinance forbad them to pray vnto Angels; and yet at this day we ſee among them and their neighbours, Oratories or Chappels to pray in to Saint Michael: which thoſe that maintained them, ſaid they did in humilitie, ſaying that the God of the whole world is inuiſible, incomprehenſible, and vnacceſſible; and therefore that they had need to make God fauourable vnto them by Angels. And that is it which Saint Paul ſayd, in humbleneſſe and ſeruice of Angels.* There are three things to be noted in this excellent place. The firſt, that *Theodoret* beleeued that the Councell of Laodicea forbad prayer to Angels. The ſecond, that he condemned the Chappels made to pray to S. *Michael*, which neuertheleſſe are vſed in the Romiſh Church. The third, that thoſe heretickes whereof he ſpeaketh, vſed the ſame words that the Church of Rome doth, which is, that to make God fauourable vnto them, they haue their recourſe to Angels and Saints, with deuotion and humilitie of ſpirit. *Baronius* is angrie, and chideth *Theodoret* for writing in this maner, in the firſt Tome of his Annals in the ſixtieth yeere.* *By this* (ſaith he) *we may ſee that Theodoret did not well vnderſtand the ſence of Saint Pauls words.* In ſuch manner our aduerſaries reſpect the Fathers.

The Canon of the Councell of Laodicea, whereof *Theodoret* makes mention, is the fiue and thirtieth Canon, the words whereof are theſe: *Chriſtians muſt not leaue the Church of God,*

* § 20. *Ex his videas Theodoretum haud feliciter (eius pace dictum ſit) aſſecutum eſſe Pauli verborũ ſenſum.*

God, to go to worship Angels, and to meet together in congregations apart, which are things prohibited. * If any one shall be found to vse this secret idolatrie, let him be accursed, because he hath forsaken our Lord Iesus Christ. Those Fathers were of opinion that men could not call vpon Angels, without leauing the Church, and renouncing Iesus Christ. For that cause also Saint *Augustine* in his booke of Heresies, putteth the Angelicans among the heretiques, which were *Angelorum cultui inclinati*, inclined or bent to the seruice of Angels.

* ὃ δεῖ χριστιανὸν ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πίνειν καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν καὶ συναξεις ποιεῖν.

Irenæus in his second booke, 58. Chapter, ioyneth with the Apostle Saint *Paul*, saying, * *The Church doth nothing by Angelicall inuocations, but purely, simply, and manifestly addresseth her prayers to God which hath made all things, in the name of our Lord Iesus Christ.*

* *Ecclesia non inuocationibus Angelicis faciens aliquid, sed mundè, purè & manifestè orationes dirigens ad Dominum, &c.*

The ordinarie excuse is, that men haue accesse to God by the Saints and Angels, as they haue accesse to kings by their officers and attendants. But the case is not all one. For kings are not in all places, neither vnderstand all things, and it is not fit that euery man should speake vnto them, and they haue need to be informed of the truth of things by others. In God it is cleane contrarie. And which is more, it is God which frameth prayers in our hearts, Rom. 8. 25, 26. Whereupon it followeth, that the prayer which God himselfe inspireth into our hearts, is pleasing or acceptable vnto him without the recommendation of the Saints. Should not the voyce of the Spirit of God speaking in our hearts be pleasing vnto God? Besides we haue already shewed, that our aduersaries do cleane contrary to that which they say, and haue recourse by God to Saints. And albeit God were in all things like vnto kings, yet when the king cals, we must go directly to him. But he saith, *Come to me*, Matth. 11. 28. and *Call vpon me*, Psal. 50. 15.

Places of Scripture for the Inuocation of Saints.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. 2. *Peter* 1. 15. *I will endeauour to haue you often after my departing, to the end that you may haue remembrance of these things.* 2. Sect.

Here is Saint Peter, which promiseth to pray for them after his death. And Geneua seeing the force of this place, set downe in these termes according to the originall, and the common translation, hath changed the order of these words by a manifest depranation: putting this particle that, *before these words,* before my departure, *which is not found in the Greeke originall.*

MOVLIN.

The onely reading of this place of Saint *Peter*, as *M. Arnoux* alledgeth it, prooueth the falshood: for there is neither sence nor reason in these words, *I will indeauour to haue you often after my departing, to the end that you may haue remembrance of these things.*

This is the place according to the Greeke: *I will endeauour therefore alwayes, that ye also may be able to haue remembrance of these things after my departing.* This word *may* in Greeke is ἔχειν, which signifieth *to haue meanes.* Yong scholers that haue but a little vnderstanding in Greeke, may easily comprehend, that this is the sence of the Greeke in the Apostle. And if it were so that we had no vnderstanding of the Greek at all, the whole sence of the place it selfe forceth vs to vnderstand it so. For Saint *Peter* in the verses before, and also in this, yeeldeth a reason vnto the faithfull why he wrote vnto them, which was, that perceiuing himselfe to be neere his death, he would leaue a remembrance of his instructions, that they might haue a meanes after his death often to remember that which he had said vnto them in his life time. This is the whole place: *For I thinke it meete as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stirre you vp, by putting you in remembrance, seeing I know that the time is at hand that I must lay downe this taber-*

σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τοῦτο ποιεῖν.

tabernacle, euen as our Lord Iesus hath shewed me. I will endeauour therefore alwayes, that ye also may be able to haue remembrance of these things after my departing. And so the greatest part of our aduersaries which haue translated or written Cōmentaries vpon this Epistle vnderstand it, as *Arias Montanus*, Cardinall *Cusanus*, the ordinary Glosse: And aboue all, *Thomas* the Prince of Schooles, is very formall in his Commentary vpon this Epistle: *Because* (saith he) *that I must soone depart, therefore while I liue, I will endeauour my selfe by aduertising you not onely once, but oftentimes also, that is to say, instantly and diligently, that you may haue a remembrance of the things after and after my death.* *Oecumenius* saith, that this exposition is the plainest, and that the other is hyperbaticall, that is to say, ouerthrowing and troubling the construction.

Quia cito trāsiturus, ideo dum viuo debo operam, vos cōmonendo, non solum semel, sed & frequenter, id est, instanter & diligenter habere vos, id est, vt habeatis memoriam dictorum post obitum meum.

Neuertheleſſe, if it were as true as it is falſe and abſurd, that Saint *Peter* promiſed the faithfull to pray for them after his death, what is that to the purpoſe? If Saint *Peter* being in heauen prayeth for the Church, doth it follow that we ought to call vpon him? doth it follow that he knowes our hearts?

ARNOVX.

83. Sect. M. Arnoux hath put two harpes.

And in Reuelation 5. 8. *The foure and twenty Elders fell downe before the Lambe, hauing euery one harpes and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints. Reade, and it is sufficient.*

MOVLIN.

The reading of this paſſage ſufficeth to ſhew that the ſame toucheth not the queſtion. The queſtion is, whether we muſt pray vnto and call vpon the Saints? Whereupon *M. Arnoux* alledgeth a place which ſaith, that the Saints preſented their prayers. This place ſaith, that the Saints prayed in heauen, but ſaith not, that we muſt pray vnto them here on earth.

In the same XXIIII. Article of the Confession of our faith.

We hold Purgatorie to be an illusion comming out of Satans shop, from whence also proceede Monasticall vowes, pilgrimages, abstinence from meats, auricular confession, indulgences, &c.

Of Purgatory.

ARNOVX.

Touching places of Scripture noted in the margent of the Confession, there are none at all but against abstinence from meates, and observation of holy dayes; vpon which the Reader may see my reply to the Ministers. 84. Sect.

They haue with the selfe-same faithfulnesse cut off the Canonicall bookes, before in the third Article, and denyed all these things, whereof one part may be proued by the bookes which for that purpose they haue cut off. In such manner, that after they haue cut the throats of the witnesses that might accuse them, they haue boldly committed a kinde of parricide.

MOVLIN.

It was not needfull to note places in the Margent against Purgatorie, nor against Monasticall vowes, pilgrimages, prohibition of marriage and of meates, auricular confession, and Indulgences or pardons, because the places noted in the margent of the fifth Article of our Confession, where humane traditions are condemned, and the perfection of the Scriptures proued, are sufficient to ouerthrow and confute those points, which are humane traditions, inuented

for gaine and for ambition. Beſides, the margent had not been great enough to confute ſo many points briefly touched in one Article. This Doctour being not able to diſgrace the body of our Confeſſion, ſeeketh to ſcratch at the margents thereof.

Touching the cutting off of the Canonicall bookes whereof we are accuſed, I haue heretofore ſufficiently ſatisfied the Reader therein, and cleared our Churches of that ſlander. And I ſay, that if we ſhould allow of Iudith, Wiſedome, and the Macchabees to be Canonicall bookes, our Aduerſaries ſhould not therein find their religion, no more then in the bookes of the Prophets and the Apoſtles. And *M. Arnoux* before in the 69. Section ſought to ſerue his turne about merits with a place out of an Apocryphall booke, but by falſifying it moſt horribly.

Then although I might leaue thoſe points as they are, againſt the which *M. Arnoux* produceth nothing but iniurious words; yet for the better ſatisfaction of the Reader, I will ſay ſomething of euery one of them.

Of the deſcription of Purgatorie.

85. *Sect. Lib. 4. cap. 1.*

To confute Purgatorie, we neede but paint it out, and ſhew it in the true colours thereof. *Baille* the Ieſuite in his Catechiſme of Controuerſies, and *Cotton* the Ieſuite in his Inſtitutions, ſay that Purgatorie is a priſon or gaole, and a place vnder the ground, aboue hell where the damned are, where the ſoules that are laden and defiled with veniall ſins, and which haue not here on earth ſatisfied the diuine Iuſtice, are purged by that temporall fire. Yet they make that fire to be as hote as that in hell, and very long; witneſſe the pardons of diuers thouſands of yeeres.

This doctrine is cruell, and beareth her condemnation in her forehead. For our aduerſaries will haue,

1 That God which hath giuen his Sonne to die for the redemption

redemption of his enemies, taketh pleasure to burne his children for their sinnes already pardoned, and for the which Iesus Christ hath made satisfaction.

2 That God tormenteth his elect in a fire, not for their amendment (for they are iustified already before they enter thereinto) but to satisfie himselfe, and to content his iustice. No father euer punished his children in such manner.

3 That God, to satisfie his iustice, exceedeth in iustice, taking two payments for one selfesame debt, and two satisfactions for one sinne, that is, the passion of Iesus Christ, and the paines of Purgatory; although the first satisfaction, which is the Passion of Iesus Christ, is most sufficient, as well for Purgatorie as for hell.

4 That the passion of Iesus Christ being sufficient to exempt vs from Purgatorie as well as from hell, neuertheleſſe God accepteth not the passion of his Sonne for as much as it is worth, but clozeth his hand, and restraineth his liberalitie, and cutteth off some of the worth of Iesus Christs death, that his children may not be exempted from torment.

5 That the passion of Iesus Christ is applied vnto vs by burning and tormenting vs for many yeeres; which is to apply the mercie of God by the execution of his iustice, to apply pardon by punishmēt, to apply the remission of our debts, by making vs pay them: and briefly, to apply the benefit and grace of Iesus Christ, by a meanes derogating from this grace, and contrary to that benefit.

6 That Iesus Christ making intercession in heauen for all the faithfull, their burning soules come not out of that fire by his intercession, but that they come forth by the Popes pardons.

7 That the Pope hauing power to draw more soules out of that fire then he doth, yet he that boasteth himselfe to be the common father of Christians, lets them burne therein many yeeres.

8 That the soules entring into Purgatorie, are already pure and without sinne, and yet haue need of purgation: for the fault remaineth no more, and yet neuertheleſſe they say

it hath need to be purged. So Purgatorie is made to purge ſoules that are pure without ſinne, and to cleanſe filthineſſe of ſinne which is no more in them.

9 That ſins pardoned are purged by torment, as if a man ſhould call a whip, a wheele, or a gibet a purgation.

10 That ſins fully pardoned, are puniſhed in this fire, and that God hauing fully defaced and taken away the fault, makes them endure paine that haue no more fault, and are no more culpable. As if God ſhould ſay vnto vs, I forgiue thee all thy ſinnes, but thou ſhalt be puniſhed in a fire. I forgiue thee all thy debt, but not the payment of the debt: for our ſins are debts, whereof the puniſhment is the payment. Certainly pardon is no other thing, then not to puniſh. And a guiltie perſon would be very well content that the King ſhould not forgiue him his fault, ſo he would remit the puniſhment. Ieſus Chriſt tooke our ſins vpon him, to the end that we ſhould be diſcharged of the puniſhment. It had been in vaine for him to haue borne all our ſatisfactorie puniſhment, if he had not diſcharged vs of it.

11 That God will haue vs fully and freely to pardon our neighbours, and holdeth him for a wicked man, that hauing been iniuried by his neighbour, would pardō his offence, but neuertheleſſe would determine to make him endure puniſhment for it. Whereby it followeth, that God will haue vs to be more mercifull then himſelfe: ſeeing that our aduerſaries ſay, that after God hath pardoned all our offences, he maketh vs ſuffer and endure ſatisfactory puniſhments in a burning fire many yeares.

12 All theſe abuſes ſpring from a peruerſe maxime which ſubuerteth all the Goſpell, which is, that Ieſus Chriſt by his death exempteth vs from ſatisfactorie puniſhments due for ſins committed before Baptiſme, but not frō ſatisfactorie puniſhments due for ſins after Baptiſme. A maxime, whereof there is not one word found in the Scripture: which neuertheleſſe ought to be more clearely ſet downe therein then any other doctrine, ſeeing that to know what Ieſus Chriſt hath done for vs, is that which makes vs Chriſtians. It is the

ſoule

ſoule and foundation of Chriſtian religion.

All that which is ſaid before, is an introduction to that which followeth.

13 That the Pope, by vertue of that which Ieſus Chriſt ſaid to *Peter*, *Whatſoeuer thou ſhalt looſe or vnbinde vpon earth, &c.* looſeth or vnbindeth alſo vnder the earth, and can deliuer ſoules out of Purgatorie: And by that power, he giueth fiue or ſixe hundred thouſand yeeres of pardon, and erecteth priuiledged Altars, whereon whoſoeuer ſaith a Maſſe vpon a certaine day, at his choice or pleaſure draweth a ſoule out of Purgatorie; and priuiledgeth certaine perſons, to whom he granteth, either not to enter at all into Purgatorie, or to come preſently out againe. Such are the white Friers, who boaſt that they haue a priuiledge to be no longer in Purgatorie thē till Saterday next enſuing after their deaths: and the Franciſcans or gray Friers, to whom Pope *Sixtus V.* in the yeere 1586. granted a free pardon, and a deliuering of a ſoule out of Purgatorie, for ſaying of certaine Pater noſters mixed with Aue Maries on Saterday before Palme Sunday, and on the feaſt day of Saint *Iohn* Baptiſt, and of S. *Iohn* Port-Latin. In the Treaſure of Indulgences of the Franciſcan or gray Friers printed in Roan, theſe words are found; *For euery day, vntill the Natiuitie of our Lady, there are* 862000 *yeeres and* 100 *dayes of pardon and remiſſion of the third part of ſinnes granted.* The booke of Roman Indulgences ſpeaketh of much more.

By Thomas Darcy in the Iewes ſtreet, neere the Palace, 1614. pag. 119.

14 Thereby there is a great trafficke made of pardons, and the Cleargie by that meanes ſucke and draw vnto themſelues the ſubſtance and treaſure of the Laitie, liuing vpon the ignorant feare of poore people, who dying, thinke themſelues to be eaſily quit of the puniſhment in hell, if they may onely remaine in a burning fire for the ſpace of ſome hundreds of yeeres: and for that cauſe bereaue their children and their heires of their goods, to giue, not vnto thoſe that weepe, but to ſuch as laugh and ſing; not to thoſe that want and haue need thereof, but to rich and idle Monks. For rich men they ſay ſtore of Maſſes and Trentals, for which

they pay deare, thereby (as they say) to ease and comfort their soules in that torment; but for the poore, or those that giue them nothing, they neuer say any particular Masses. They die good cheape. They must content themselues with generall prayers, whereof neuertheleſſe rich men also haue a part. Towards the poore they will haue God to vse the rule of the Gospell, which is, *Verily I say vnto thee, thou shalt not come out thence, vntill thou hast payd the vttermost farthing*, Mathew. 5. 26.

The opinion of the ancient Fathers, touching the state of the soules of the faithfull after they are dead.

86. Sect.

The ancient Fathers were so farre off from beleeuing that the soules of the faithfull are tormented in a fire before the day of Iudgement, that many of them are of opinion, that the soule cannot suffer any torment when it is once separated from the body. *Tertullian* in the fortie eighth chapter of his Apologie saith, *The soule alone cannot suffer any torment without solid matter or substance, that is, without the flesh.* He saith the same in his book of the Testimony of the soule, chapter 4. *Gregorie de Nisse* in the third oration of the Resurrection of Christ, saith, * *Fire can by no meanes touch the soule separated from the body, neither can darkenesse be troublesome vnto it, because it hath no eyes. For these conuenient Reasons, we are moued and perswaded to allow of the resurrection of the dead.*

Neque pati quicquam poteſt anima ſola ſine ſtabili materia, id eſt, carne.

* *Animam per ſe ſeparatim ignis nunquã attigerit, nec tenebræ quidem ei moleſtæ fuerint, vtpote quæ oculis careat, &c.*

* τῆς σαρκὸς χωρὶς ἐκ ἀποδύσεται τὰ ἀπορρήτα ἀγαθὰ ἐκεῖνα οὐδὲ ὑποστήσεται κολασθῆναι.

Chryſostome in his thirtie nine Homilie vpon the first of the Corinthians, saith,* *Although the soule remaineth, although it were ten thousand times immortall, as in truth it is, it shall not without the body receiue those vnspeakable blessings, nor suffer any punishment.* All the punishment which the soules suffer being separated from their bodies (according to Saint *Ambrose*, in his 10. chapter of the booke of the Benefit

Benefit of death) is, that they are in great feare and disquietnesse, attending the punishment which is prepared for them at the later day.

Staying for the latter day, many of the Fathers place the soules both of the good and the wicked, in holes or dennes vnder the earth, or in certaine secret places which they call receptacles. [a] *Tertullian*, in the 55. chapter of his booke of the Soule, saith, *We hold for certaine, that all the soules are set apart in hell vntill the day of the Lord.* *Irenaeus* saith the like in his fifth booke, grounding vpon this, that Iesus Christ was in hell vntill his resurrection, whose example all the faithfull must follow; [b] *For* (saith he) *the disciple is not aboue his master.*

Origen in his 2. booke of Principles, cap. 12. saith, [c] *I am of opinion, that all the Saints going out of this world, stay in a place of the earth, which the Scripture calleth Paradise, or in some place of instruction, and as it were in an Auditorie.* And from hence he makes the soules to ascend vp by degrees higher and higher.

Lactantius in his seuenth booke, cap. 21. saith, [d] *All mens soules are kept in a common prison, vntill such time that the great Iudge calleth them to account for all which they haue done.*

Saint *Hilarie* vpon the 38 Psalme saith: [e] *It is a law of necessitie, whereunto all men are subiect, that their soules descend downe into hell after their bodies are buried, which descending Iesus Christ himselfe refused not, to accomplish that which belonged vnto his manhood.*

Victorinus Martyr, on the 6. of the Reuelation, saith that S. *Iohn* saw the soules of those that were slaine & martyred vnder the Altar, and saith *Sub ara, id est, sub terra*: esteeming that the soules of the Saints are vnder the earth.

Nouatianus in chap. 1. of his Booke of the Trinitie, saith, [f] *The things that are vnder the earth, are not without power*

a *Cõst tuimus omnem animã apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini.*

b *Animæ abierunt in inuisibilem locũ definitum ipsis à Deo, & vbi vsque ad reformationem commorabuntur.*

c *Puto quod sanctũ quique discendentes de hac vita permaneant in loco aliquo in terra posito, quem Paradisum dicit Scriptura diuina, velut in quadam eruditionis loco, & vita dicam auditorio.*

d *Omnes in vna communique custodia detinentur donec*

tempus adueniat, qua maximus Iudex meritorum faciat examen. e *Humanæ ista lex necessitatis vt sepultis corporibus animæ ad inferos descendant. Quam descensionem Dominus ad conjunctionem veri, homini non recusauit.* f *Quæ infra terram iacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis & ordinatis potestatibus vacua. Locus enim est quò piorum anima & impiorum ducuntur.*

diſpoſed by order: for it is the place whither the ſoules of the faithfull and of the wicked are carried, having already a preſage of the future Iudgement.

Saint *Auguſtine* is very vncertaine in this matter, yet theſe are his words vpon the 36. Pſalme: [a] *After this ſhort life, thou ſhalt not yet be in the place where the Saints ſhall be, to whom it ſhall be ſaid, Come ye bleſſed of my Father, &c. Thou ſhalt not yet be there: who knowes not that? But thou maieſt be there where the proud rich man being in torment ſaw the miſerable poore man in reſt, in which reſt thou ſhalt remaine quietly till the day of Iudgement.* And in his 12. booke of the Citie of God, chapter 9. he ſaith, [b] *That part of the Citie of God that ſhould be ioyned to the immortall Angels, being an aſſembly of mortall men, is either a pilgrimage on earth in a mortall condition, or as touching thoſe that are dead, conſiſteth in the hidden receptacles and ſeates of the ſoules.*

And in his Manuell to *Laurentius*, chapter 109. he ſaith, [c] *The time that is betweene death and the laſt reſurrection, holdeth the ſoules in ſecret receptacles, according as every one is worthy of reſt or torment.*

Chryſoſtome, in his eight and twentieth Homilie, vpon the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes, ſaith, [d] That *Abel* hath not yet receiued the crowne, nor *Noah*, and that they are ſet in a place ſtaying for vs; and that That place where the ſoules ſtay, by the Fathers is ordinarily called *Abrahams* Boſome. And yet neuertheleſſe, as well in *Chryſoſtome* as in *Auguſtine* there are places found, which ſay that the ſoules of the faithfull leauing their bodies, go ſtraight to Ieſus Chriſt, and ſee God face to face. And Saint *Auguſtine* in his firſt booke and fourteenth chapter of Retractations moueth this queſtion, and leaueth it vndecided without reſolution. Whereupon alſo *Sixtus Senenſis* keeper of the Popes Librarie, in his ſixt booke, three hundred fortie and fifth Annotation, ſaith, that the Church had not as yet reſolued vpon any certainty touching that Article.

Almoſt all the Greeke Fathers deferre the bleſſednes of

[a] *Poſt vitam iſtam nondum eris vbi erunt ſancti, quibus dicetur, Venite benedicti, &c. Nondum ibi eris, quis neſcit?*

[b] *Nunc vel mortaliter peregrinantur in terris, vel in eis qui mortem obierunt ſecretis animarum receptaculis, ſed illis vſque requieſcent.*

[c] *Tempus quod inter hominis mortem & vltimam reſurrectionem interpoſitum eſt, animas abditis receptaculis continet, ſicut vnamquamque digna eſt vel requie vel ærumna.*

[d] τὸ μὲν πολὺ τῶν ἁγίων ἀπελθὸν ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ βίου καὶ ἐκεῖνο μένει καὶ ἀναμένει, τὴν ἄνω.

mens ſoules vntill the reſurrection, as *Theodoretus*, *Arethas*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylactus*, and *Euthymius*: with whom Pope *Iohn* the 22. ioyned, as *Gerſon* in his Sermon of Eaſter witneſſeth. *Villanus* in the tenth booke of his Hiſtorie, and *Eraſmus* in his Preface vpon the fifth of *Irenaus*: And *Okam* in his worke of 93. dayes: the reſt of the ſoules in their receptacles by ſome ancient Fathers is called a ſleeping. The Canon of the Maſſe prayeth for the dead in theſe termes: *Remember, ô Lord, thy ſeruants which ſleepe in the ſlumber of peace.* For when that prayer was hatcht, they did not beleeue that the ſoules of the children of God were tormented in a fire.

Many did not beleeue that the ſoules ſhould come out of thoſe receptacles all at one time, and that ſome ſhould not riſe ſo ſoone as others, that is, ſuch as were heauier laden with ſinnes, which ſhould be puniſhed by the delaying of their reſurrection. *Modicum quodque delictum mora reſurrectionis luendo*: as *Tertullian* in the laſt chapter of his booke of the Soule ſaith: And following that error, he will haue a womã to pray for her husband that is dead, * *and that ſhe aske ſome refreſhing for him, & keepe him company in the firſt reſurrection*; in his booke of Monogamia, cap. 10. Which alſo is conformable to the prayer which * *Ambroſe* made for *Gratian* and *Valentinian* that were dead, deſiring God *that it would pleaſe him, to releeue and raiſe them vp in the beſt time.*

But I find the Fathers agree in nothing more then in this opinion, that as ſoone as the dead ſhall be riſen, they ſhall be ſindged and burnt by the fire of the day of Iudgement, which they call a Baptiſme of fire, and the flaming ſword at the entrie of Paradiſe, from which fire they exempt no man, no not the Apoſtles, nor the virgin *Marie.*

Ambroſe in his twentieth Sermon vpon the 118. Pſalme, ſaith, * *Euery man muſt paſſe through the flame, whether it be Iohn the Euangeliſt whom God loued, or Saint Peter.* And in his third Sermon vpon the 36. Pſalme, * *The ſonnes of Leui ſhalbe purged by fire. Ezechiel, Daniel, and theſe, although they ſhall be examined by fire, ſhall neuertheleſſe ſay, We haue paſſed through fire and water.*

* *Refrigerium ei adpoſtulet & in prima reſurrectione conſortium.*

* *Orat. funebr. de obitu Valentiniani, Te quaeſo ſumme Deus, vt charissimos iuuenes matura reſurrectione ſuſcites & reſuſcite.*

* *Omnes oportet tranſire per flammas, ſiue ille Iohannes Euangeliſta, ſiue ille Petrus.*

* *Igne purgabuntur filij Leui, igne Ezechiel, igne Daniel, &c.*

Lactantius

Lactantius in his seuenth booke, chap. 21. saith, [a] *When God shall haue iudged the iust, he will examine them by fire. Then those whose sinnes shall exceed either in weight or number, shall be seared by fire and and lightly burnt.*

Saint *Hilarie* vpon the 119. Psalme in the third part, maketh the Virgin *Marie* to passe thorow this fire of the last Iudgement, saying, [b] *Shall we desire the day of Iudgement, wherein we must passe thorow that indefatigable fire, wherein we must vndergo those grieuous punishments to purge and cleanse our soules of their sinnes?* And a little after, [c] *If the Virgin which conceiued God, must vndergo the seueritie of that iudgement, what is he that dares desire to be iudged of God?* And in the second Canon vpon Saint *Mathew*: [d] *Those that are baptized by the holy Ghost, must also passe thorow the fire of Iudgement.*

Saint *Augustine* in his sixteenth booke, chap. 34. of the Citie of God, saith, [e] *By that fire* (which appeared vnto *Abraham*) *is signified the day of Iudgement, which shall separate the carnall that shall be saued by fire, and those that shalbe damned to the fire.* And in the twentieth booke, and 25. chapter: [f] *By the things aforesaid, it appeareth euidently, that in that Iudgement there shall be some purging paines giuen to some men.* The title of the Chapter sheweth, that he expresly speaketh of the last Iudgement.

Origen in his third Homilie vpon the 36. Psalme saith, [g] *I thinke we must all come to that fire, yea though it were a Saint Paul, or a Saint Peter, yet he must come to that fire.*

Gregorie Nazianzen in his foure and twentieth Sermon of Baptisme, calleth Penance a second painefull purgation after Baptisme. *But* (saith he) *who will warrant me that this cure will come to any end, and that the Iudgement will not ouertake vs, as being yet indebted, and hauing need of burning in the fire which shall be there?*

Basill in the fifteenth chapter of the booke of the holy Ghost (if that be his worke) saith: that by the Baptisme

a Iustos cùm iudicauerit Deus, igni eos examinabit: Tum quorum peccata vel pondere vel numero preualuerint perstringentur atq; amburentur.

b Gimel.

c Si in iudicij seueritatem capax illa Dei virgo venturà est, desidera-e quis audebit à Deo iudicari?

d Baptizatis in spiritu S. reliquum sit consummari igne iudicij.

e Significatur ista igne dies iudicij: diximus carnales per ignem saluandos, & igne damnandos.

f Ex his quæ dicta sunt videtur euidenter apparere, in illo iudicio quasdam quasi pœnas purgatorias futuras.

g ὀφείλοντας ἡμᾶς ἅπαντας ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ τοῦτο ἐλθεῖν· κἂν Παῦλος ᾖ καὶ Πέτρος, ἐπὶ τοῦτο δεῖ ἐλθεῖν.

h τὸ τοῦ πυρὸς βάπτισμα τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τῆς κρίσεως δοκιμασία

of fire, whereof Iesus Christ speaketh, is vnderstood *the triall that shall be made at the day of Iudgement. Gregorie de Nisse* speaketh of the same purging fire, in his Oration of those that sleepe. And *Cyril* of Ierusalem in the fifteenth Catechisme, saying, [i] That at the day of Iudgement *the Lord will come in the clouds from heauen, drawing after him a flood of fire, to trie men.*

[i] ἔρχεται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῶν νεφέλων ποταμὸν πυρὸς ἕλκοντος ὄχλους ἀνθρώπων.

Such is the Purgatorie of the ancient Fathers, and not a fire vnder the ground, where the soules of the faithfull should be burnt before the day of Iudgement for sinnes that are pardoned, nor a prison whereof the Pope is the Iaylour. And all the seruice and the prayers for the dead which are said in the Romish Church, do not in any sort speake of the fire of Purgatorie, but of the sleeping of the soule, and not that they are cast into eternall fire. So the Greeks Churches pray for the dead, & deny Purgatorie. *Epiphanius* in the heresie of *Aerius*, & *Denis* in the booke of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie speaketh of prayer for the dead, and neuertheless presupposeth that the dead for whom they pray, are already in rest and blessednesse. Saint *Augustine* in his booke of the Care for the dead, approueth prayer for the dead, but in all that booke speaketh not one word of Purgatorie. The second booke of *Machabees*, chapter 12. commendeth prayer for the dead, when in that prayer men haue a regard vnto the resurrection: that is to say, when we pray for one that is dead, that he may rise to saluation, but not to draw him out of Purgatorie. The Ancients prayed, and gaue gifts, and made offerings for the dead to the end aforesaid, to wit, for the quiet resting of soules for the resurrection, and that the dead may rise one of the first, and to the end that he may be friendly handled by the purging fire of the day of Iudgement, but neuer to draw a soule out of Purgatorie. And to conclude: in all antiquity there is no mention made of priuiledged Altars, wherein he that causeth a Masse to be said, draweth a soule out of Purgatorie at his choise, nor of pardons giuen by the Pope to the dead.

In the time of Pope *Gregorie* the first, that wrote in anno 595.

595, Satan hatched that which the ages ensuing haue disclosed. For by the fourth booke of Dialogues written by this Pope, you may see that then they placed Purgatorie in the wind, in the smoke of baths, and in riuers. At last Purgatorie was put vnder the ground, and placed neere to hell. *Bellarmine* in his second booke of Purgatory and sixt chapter saith, That in a manner all the Doctors are of one accord, that the damned and the soules in Purgatorie are in one selfesame place, and are tormented all alike. And yet when the soules come out of that fire, they will not haue them presently to enter into Paradise. For *Beda*, and after him *Bellarmine* in the seuenth chapter of his first booke of Purgatory, will haue the soules when they come out of that fire, to refresh themselues for a while in a medow full of flowers which is neere to that place. Which is a subiect of profound speculation, as if there were greene medowes full of flowers in the concauities vnder ground, where there is no Sunne: & as if the soules could smell flowers: then who mowes those medowes?

This fabulous doctrine, forged to entice the Clergie, and to affright the consciences of the ignorant, must be examined by the Word of God.

Confutation of Purgatorie by the Word of God.

87. Sect. 1 This doctrine agreeth not with the holy Scripture, wherein there is no mention made of seruice nor sacrifice made to draw mens soules out of a fire after this life, nor of any power giuen to the Apostles to deliuer any soules out of Purgatorie, nor of any priuiledged altars, nor of any pardons giuen to the dead. All this proceeds from the vnwritten word.

2 The second booke of *Machabees*, which we haue proued not to be canonical, in the 12. chapter speaketh of praying for the dead, and saith, that that prayer is made hauing respect to the resurrection, that is, to the end that the dead may rise to saluation,

ſaluation, but not to draw them out of Purgatory. On the contrary, there it is ſaid, that if *Iuda* had not hoped that the dead ſhould riſe againe, it had been a ſuperfluous thing, and full of follie, to pray for the dead. Then the prayer for the dead which is made in the Romiſh church, by the iudgement of the Author of that booke, is fooliſh, becauſe it is not made in hope, or with any regard of the reſurrection, but to pull mens ſoules out of a burning fire.

3 The holy Scriptures giue vs many examples of men that when they died entred into bleſſednes. Luk. 2. 29. *Simeon* made account to enter into reſt by his death, ſaying, *Lord, now letteſt thou thy ſeruant depart in peace, according to thy word.* Luke 16. 22. *Lazarus* ſoule is by Angels carried into *Abrahams* boſome, where it is comforted, while the wicked rich man was tormented. Ieſus Chriſt ſaid to the good thiefe at his death, *This day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.*

4 They make anſwer, that theſe are exceptions which derogate nothing from the generall rule. But they that ſay ſo, ought to produce that generall rule, and find it in the Scriptures. Theſe people will haue, that in the Scripture there ſhould be nothing but exceptions without rules. At the leaſt, if they want rules, let them find one onely example of a ſoule that is ſent to that fire. But they neither produce examples nor rules. Contrariwiſe we produce a whole age, wherein all thoſe that ſhall liue, ſhall be exempted from Purgatory, that is, thoſe that ſhall be aliue in the world when the Day of Iudgement ſhall happen. Seeing then you ſee ſo many men that ſhall be ſaued without Purgatory, & that the Pope himſelfe exempteth many from it, why cannot God exempt the reſt, without doing wrong to his iuſtice?

5 The Prophet *Eſay* 57. 1. ſpeaketh thus of the death of the faithfull: *The righteous is taken away from the euill to come: he ſhall enter into peace, they ſhall reſt in their beds, each one walking in his vprightneſſe.* The Spirit of God, Reuel. 2. 10. ſaith, *Be thou faithfull vnto the death, and I will giue thee the crowne of life.* Then the faithfull by death obtaine the crowne of life, & are not caſt into a fire vnder the ground. And Saint *Paul*, 2. Cor.

5. 1.

5. 1. saith, *For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be destroyed, we haue an eternall house in heauen.* And Reuel. 14. 13. *The dead which die in the Lord, are fully blessed; euen so saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labors, and their workes follow them.* The Apostle, Heb. 9. 27. saith, *It is appointed vnto men that they shall die once, and after that commeth the Iudgement.* He should say as the Papists say, and after that Purgatorie.

6 The wise man in Ecclesiastes 12. 7. saith, *Then shall the dust returne to the earth as it was, but the spirit shall returne vnto God who gaue it.* And the Apostle, Rom. 8. 1. saith, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Iesus.* If no condemnation, then in no eternall fire, nor in no temporall fire. And Iesus Christ, Ioh. 5. 24. saith, *He that heareth my word, and beleeueth on him that sent me, hath euerlasting life, and shall not come into iudgement, but hath passed from death vnto life.* Then he entreth not into a fire like to that wherein the damned are.

7 And seeing that our aduersaries hold the booke of Wisdome to be canonicall, why do they contradict the words thereof, cap. 3. 6. which are so euident and cleare, saying: *The soules of the righteous are in the hands of God, there shall no torment touch them?* For they hold that the soules in Purgatorie are righteous.

8 Adde hereunto the places alledged, and the reasons at large produced against Satisfactions in generall, wherein we haue shewed how castigatorie punishments are compatible with full pardon, & are benefits & spirituall cures, but not satisfactory punishments. Where also we haue shewed how S. Iohn in his first Epistle, 1. 7. saith, *That the blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne.* And S. *Paul* Col. 2. 13. saith, *That God hath freely forgiuen vs all our trespasses.* He saith *all & freely*, to the end to exclude all satisfaction on our parts to the iustice of God. For if we must satisfie the Iustice of God by our torments, we can neuer make satisfaction for the least part of our sinnes, for that God receiueth no satisfaction but that which is most exact and complete; for the Scripture telleth vs, *that he which calleth his brother foole, shall be punished with hell fire*, Matth. 5. 22. And *that no railers shall in-*

herite

heritethe Kingdome of God, 1. Cor. 6. 10. Faults wherewith euen the better ſort of Chriſtians are ſometimes ouertaken.

9 The proofes drawne from the definition are demonſtratiue. To know then whether God pardoneth our offences without any ſatisfying puniſhments on our behalfe, we muſt know what it is to pardon. I ſay then, that *to pardon*, is to remit the penalty or puniſhment deſerued, and not to impoſe anie ſatisfying puniſhments, nor to take any vengeance or reuenge. Now God forgiueth vs all our offences, and doth it freely; therefore he expecteth no puniſhment nor ſatisfactory paines from vs.

10 God alſo is a moſt gracious father. Now a Father (if he be not altogether vnnaturall) neuer correcteth his childrē to draw any ſatisfaction from them, but giueth correction to amēd them. The afflictions of this preſent life ſerue to amend vs, and not to appeaſe his wrath. But the torments of Purgatorie ſerue not to amend a ſinner, ſeeing that there the ſoules ſinne no more. They will haue them onely ſerue to ſatisfie the iuſtice of the Iudge. Then they are not cortections of a father, but puniſhments of an angrie Iudge.

11 All ſatisfactory puniſhment is a ſatisfaction for a fault. Now when the fault is wholly remitted, there is no more ſatisfactory puniſhment to be endured.

12 And all purgation is to cleanſe ſome filthines or ſpot: but in the fire of Purgatorie no ſpots or filthineſſe are purged; for paine is not a ſpot nor a filthineſſe, but the fault. The fault then being aboliſhed and pardoned, what is there more to be purged?

13 To ſay, that after the king hath pardoned a man, he will haue him to make ſatisfaction to the partie offended, is nothing to the purpoſe. For the king and the partie are two. But here the King which is God, is alſo the partie, who being reconciled, and hauing remitted all his right, there reſteth no more parties to be contented, nor ſatisfaction to be made vnto iuſtice.

14 To ſay that the benefit of Ieſus Chriſts paſſion is applied vnto vs by burning and tormenting vs in a fire, it is not

onely

onely to ſpeake without authority of the Scripture, but alſo to contrary the Scripture, which ſaith, Heb. 1. 3. *That Ieſus Chriſt hath himſelfe purged our ſinnes.* Then not by fire, nor by the tormenting of ſoules which he hath bought with ſo great a price.

15 Touching the eaſe and comfort which the ſoules in Purgatory receiue by the prayers of the liuing, Eccleſiaſtes 9. 5. 6. ſaith, *That the dead haue not any more reward, neither haue they any more portion for euer in any thing that is done vnder the Sunne.* Therefore God who in his Law ordained ſacrifices and purifications for all ſorts of ſinnes and corporall filthineſſes, euen for the Leper, and for touching and handling of the dead, ordained not any ſacrifice nor propitiation for the dead.

Neuertheleſſe, to maintaine this fire, our aduerſaries gather heapes of ſtraw, that is, ſome ſmall and light places out of the Scripture, wherat I wonder how they can be ſo ill aduiſed, ſeeing that the ſame places are of no value for their purpoſe.

They alledge Luke 12. 58. 59. which ſaith, *While thou goeſt with thine aduerſarie to the magiſtrate, as thou art in the way, giue diligence that thou maiſt be deliuered from him, leſt he draw thee to the Iudge, and the Iudge deliuer thee to the Iaylor, and the Iaylor caſt thee into priſon. I tell thee, thou ſhalt not depart thence till thou haſt payed the vtmoſt mite.* And Matth. 5. 25. ſaith, *Agree with thine aduerſary quickly*, in ſtead of theſe words, *Giue diligence in the way that thou maieſt be deliuered from him.* Our aduerſaries will haue the way to ſignifie life, the Magiſtrate God, and the priſon the fire of Purgatory, the aduerſarie the diuell: and by conſequence they would haue vs to agree with the diuell. And if in this place it is meant that the diuell is the aduerſarie, who ſhall be the executioner? And are we in the way with the diuell? for Saint *Matthew* ſaith, *Agree with thine aduerſary quickly whileſt thou art in the way with him.* For theſe cauſes ſome of them will haue the diuell to be the ſergeant, & the Law the aduerſarie; which is yet worſe. For doth the diuell draw the faithfull into Purgatory? Are we

in

in the way with the Law? Is the Law of God our enemy? Are we to ſeeke meanes to deliuer our ſelues from it, and to ſhake off the yoake thereof? For Saint *Luke* ſaith, that we muſt giue diligence in the way, that we may be deliuered from our aduerſary. And what abſurdity is it, to call a priſon a burning fornace? And how is Purgatory a priſon, from whence the ſoules ſhall not come forth till they haue payd the laſt farthing, ſeeing that the Pope, by pardons, taketh ſoules from thence before ſatisfaction is fully accompliſhed? And, albeit we ſhould receiue and allow of their Allegories for demonſtrations, and according to the ſenſe which it pleaſeth them to giue them, yet in the end they muſt proue that this Purgatory is a fire, and not a water, or a field couered ouer with ſnow, wherein the ſoules waſh, or role and turne themſelues; for in this place there is no more ſpoken of fire then of water.

The ſence of this place is cleare and manifeſt. Ieſus Chriſt exhorteth vs to peace and concord with our neighbours that trouble vs, and counſelleth vs not to wrangle and ſtriue with them in law. That is the counſell which Saint *Paul* giueth, 1. Cor. 6. 4. to end our controuerſies rather by the aduice and arbitration of brethren of the Church, then to go to law before Iudges that are Infidels. So Saint *Ambroſe* expoundeth the twelfe of Saint *Luke*, where he ſaith, that Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh, **To make peace betweene brethren that are at variance.* *Hilary* likewiſe in his fourth Canon vpon Saint *Matthew*. And * *Hierome* in his Annotations vpon the fifth of Saint *Matthew*. Among the Greekes, *Chryſoſtome*, *Euthymius* and *Theophylactus* vpon the fifth of Saint *Matthew*. *Maldonat* the Ieſuite vpon the ſame place, by the priſon vnderſtandeth hell, by the Sergeant, the diuell. But *Barradius* the Ieſuite, and Cardinall *Toles* vpon the twelfth of Saint *Luke*, expound this place as we do.

* Reconciliauda pace diſſidentium fratrum.

* Manifeſtus eſt ſenſus, quòd nos Dominus & Seruator noſter, dum in ſæculi via currimus, ad pacem & concordiam hortatur.

Some alledge theſe words of the Apoſtle, 1. Corinth. 15. 29. *What ſhall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead riſe not at all?* From whence they inferre with incomparable ſubtilty, that therefore there muſt needs be a Purgatorie.

gatory. To proue Purgatory in that ſort, is ſilently to confeſſe, that there is none. By *being baptized* they vnderſtand, *to be afflicted*: from whence they inferre, *that to be afflicted* ſignifieth, *to afflict our ſelues, to faſt, to whip our ſelues, and to pay for Maſſes to be ſaid for the dead.* For, whoſoeuer (ſay they) afflicteth himſelfe, and doth penall works for the dead, preſuppoſeth that there is a fire of Purgatory. I thinke, that ſaying ſo, they do not thinke that they ſhall be beleeued; and none of the ancient Fathers euer expounded this place in that manner. For although that ſometimes afflictions are called a Baptiſme, yet it ſhall neuer be found, that to be baptized, ſignifieth that a man ſhould afflict himſelfe. As alſo, that whoſoeuer afflicteth himſelfe for a dead man, doth not neceſſarily preſuppoſe that he is in a fire. Can he not afflict himſelfe, ſhead teares, and pray, to the end he may obtaine Gods fauour, that the dead ſhall riſe againe to ſalnation? which is the end of the prayer for the dead, which is ſpoken of in the ſecond booke of the Maccabees, Chapter 12. And why ſhould he that afflicteth himſelfe for a dead man, bee more bound to beleeue that the dead man is in a fire then in a water?

ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ τῇ παρεδηλωμένῃ δὲ ἀσπᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ καλλίστῃ πασῶν ἐπιμαρτυρεῖται τὸ τοὺς τεθνεῶτας βαπτίζεσθαι, ἃ ἐν οἷς καὶ τὴν παρὰ δόξαν τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐλθοῦσιν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὡς τινὲς μὲν πρὸ τῶν τοὺς ἀφηρεθέντας τελευτᾶν ἄνευ βαπτίσματος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς ἔντομα. εἶτα νομίζειν βαπτίζεσθαι, &c.

Touching the true ſence of this place, I confeſſe that it is one of the obſcure places in the Scripture, whereby God exerciſeth our ſobriety. Yet I will ſpeake that which I thinke to be moſt probable. From *Cerinthus* came the hereſie of the Cerinthians, which denied that Ieſus Chriſt roſe againe, and thereby weakened the beliefe of the reſurrection of the dead. This *Cerinthus* liued in the Apoſtles time, if wee beleeue *Epiphanius*, and vſed many meanes to oppoſe againſt them, and to hinder their preaching. Of theſe heretickes *Epiphanius* in the hereſie of the Cerinthians, which is the eighth, ſaith, That when any of them died without Baptiſme, they baptized ſome other man in the name of the dead perſon, fearing leſt he ſhould bee puniſhed at the day of the reſurrection, becauſe he died without Baptiſme. Againſt theſe heretickes, who denying the reſurrection of Ieſus Chriſt, ſilently made the generall reſurrection doubtfull,

full, *Epiphanius* esteemed that Saint *Paul* in this place disputeth, and seeketh to confute them by themselues, saying, That if according to the doctrine of those false Doctors, the dead should not rise againe, how commeth it, that among them liuing men are baptized for the dead that were not baptized, to the end that the Baptisme of the liuing man receiued, for and in the name of the dead man, might be profitable vnto that dead man in the resurrection? So the Apostle sheweth them that they contradict themselues. This exposition is confirmed by *Tertullian*, in the eight and fortieth Chap. of his booke of the Resurrection of the flesh; *How* (saith he) *are they baptized for the dead? Certainly he maintaineth that they ordained this custome, grounded vpon this opinion, whereby they thought that Baptisme receiued for another, should bee profitable to another body, for the assurance of the Resurrection.* From thence the Marcionites brought vp a custome, to put a liuing man vnder the bed, wherein a dead man lay that dyed without Baptisme, and then asked the dead man, and said; Wilt thou bee baptized? Whereunto the liuing man hidden vnder the bed, made answer and said: *I will*; as *Chrysostome* in his fortieth Homilie vpon the first Epistle to the Corinthians saith.

Si autem & baptizantur quidam pro mortuis, videbimus an ratione; certe illa præsumptione hoc eos instituisse contendit, qua alij etiam carni vicarium baptisma profuturum existimarent ad spem resurrectionis.

The place wherewith they make the greatest shew, is the 12. Chap. of S. *Matthew* 32. verse, where Iesus Christ speaking against the sinne of the holy Ghost, saith, *It shall not be forgiuen him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.* The world to come (our Aduersaries say) is the fire of Purgatory. But how is that possible? Seeing that (if wee may beleeue it) Purgatory was before Christ was borne? And why should that world to come rather be a fire then a water, or an ice? for there is no mention made neither of the one or the other. Besides that, how will they haue that world to come wherein sinnes are pardoned to be Purgatory, seeing that Purgatory is a torment and a punishment? and that (according to their doctrine) sinne is already pardoned before the soules enter into Purgatory.

The sence of this place is cleare. Not to pardon sinne, is to punish it. Then Iesus Christ declareth, that God will punish the sinne against the holy Ghost in this life, and at the day of Iudgement, which is called the other world, Luk. 20. 35. *They shall be counted worthy to enioy that world, and the resurrection from the dead.*

They also alledge 1. Corinthians, Chap. 3. verse 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. where Saint *Paul* saith, *For other foundation can no man lay then that which is layd, which is Iesus Christ. And if any man build on this foundation, gold, siluer, precious stones, timber, hay, or stubble, euery mans worke shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be reuealed by fire, and the fire shall trie euery mans worke of what sort it is: If any mans worke abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receiue wages; If any mans worke burne, he shall loose, but he shall be saued himselfe, yet so as it were by fire.* Our Aduersaries will haue this fire to be Purgatory.

I answere, first, That we can ground no doctrine vpon allegoricall places. Secondly, That seeing our Aduersaries vnderstand the words, wood, hay, stubble, or siluer, allegorically, there is no reason to take the onely word *Fire* properly; specially seeing that that is the onely word whereupon the Apostle putteth the note of a similitude, saying, *He shall be saued, yet as it were by fire.* Thirdly, adde hereunto, that here he speaketh of a fire which trieth the worke, and not of fire which punisheth the person. Fourthly, of a fire whereby the worke shalbe made manifest: but what is done in Purgatorie is not manifest. Fiftly, *Of euery mans worke*: then of the Apostles and the Martyrs works, whom neuertheless the Church of Rome exempts from Purgatory. Sixtly, also here it is spoken of a fire wherein the worke burneth, and not soules. Seuenthly, of a fire whereby the workman loseth his worke, but in Purgatory nothing is lost. And if men will say that sins therein are lost, there is a benefit in that losse.

The sence of the place is plaine. The Apostle speaketh of Pastors & Doctors, which in teaching retaine the foundation, which is Iesus Christ, whereupon some build holy and firme

doctrines,

doctrines, which are called gold, siluer, and precious stones: other build vaine & light doctrines, which degenerate from the price and solidity of the foundation, and are called wood, hay and stubble. The Apostle saith, that those light doctrines, examined by the Word of God, as metals by fire, shall not subsist; that the worke of such a Minister shall perish, and that proofe shall manifest and make knowne, that there is no firmenesse in it. But touching the person of the Pastor, although his worke perisheth, yet he may be saued, because of the foundation which he hath holden: but yet after a triall of his worke hath bene made, as metals are tried by fire. Therefore here the Apostle speaketh of a triall that shall be made in this life, and not afterward: and of a triall of the doctrine of Pastors, and not of tormenting of soules in a fire.

Some make a shew of the place of Saint *Paul*, Philip. 2. 10. *That at the name of Iesus euery knee should bow, both of things in heauen, and things in earth, and things vnder the earth.* And of that which is said, Reuel. 5. 13. *And all the creatures which are in heauen, and on the earth, and vnder the earth, & in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Praise, & honour, and glory, and power, be vnto him that sitteth vpon the throne, and vnto the Lambe for euermore, &c.* With these places our aduersaries blow this imaginary fire, saying, that those that are vnder the earth, are the soules that are tormented in Purgatory. They ought also to tell vs, what those creatures are which are in the sea: and also shew vs a reason why by those that are vnder the earth they will sooner vnderstād soules in Purgatory, then the soules of little childrē that died before they were baptized, because they place them also vnder the groūd. But there is much more apparence and likelihood, that by those which are vnder the earth, is vnderstood those whose bodies are in the graues, or those that are in hell: for all men both good and bad shall bow their knees before Iesus Christ at the day of Iudgement, and shall humble themselues in his presence. For Saint *Paul* in that place to the Philippians speaketh of the kingdome giuen to Iesus Christ ouer all creatures without exception. As also in Rom. 14. 10, 11, where

God ſaith thus, *For we ſhall all appeare before the Iudgemẽt-ſeate of Chriſt. For it is written, I liue (ſaith the Lord) and euery knee ſhall bow to me, and all tongues ſhall confeſſe vnto God.* In this place it is plaine, that the Apoſtle taketh, *Appeare before the Iudgement ſeate of Chriſt, and to bow the knee before God,* for one ſelfe ſame thing. To kindle this imaginary fire, they yet bring a match which will not take light, that is, the 21. chap. of the Reuelation, 27. verſ. where the Spirit of God ſpeaking of the celeſtiall Ieruſalem, ſaith, *And there ſhall enter into it no vncleane thing*: from whence they infer, that the ſoules of the faithfull that are ſpotted with ſinne, ought to be purged before they enter into Paradiſe. But the words following ſhew, that by *the vncleane* is not vnderſtood the faithfull ſpotted with ſinne, but the wicked and the abominable. This is the whole place: *And there ſhall enter into it no vncleane thing, neither whatſoeuer worketh abomination or lies, but they which are written in the Lambes booke of life.* Then thoſe *vncleane* are the abominable and liers, and ſuch as are not written in the Booke of life. Not then the ſoules of the faithfull, which haue no need to be put in the crurible or into the fire to bee purified. *For the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt purgeth them from all ſinne,* 1. Iohn 1. 7.

The reſt of the places which they alledge, haue ſo little ſhew, that we thinke our aduerſaries are beholding vnto vs for paſſing by them. If in the Scripture there be any ſpeach of a boyling pot, or of the filthineſſe of the daughters of Sion, or of a ditch wherein there is no water, or if it be ſaid that God rebuketh in his wrath, they are (as they ſay) as many proofes of Purgatory. Couetouſneſſe hath made theſe Doctors expert in fire-works, and moſt induſtrious to kindle this fire. They want nothing but the Word of God and common ſenſe.

Places out of the ancient Fathers againſt Purgatory.

We haue already heard, how diuers ancient Fathers are of opinion

opinion that the ſoule cannot be tormented without the body. An opinion directly againſt the torment of ſoules in Purgatory. We haue alſo ſeene how prayer for the dead practiſed in the ancient Church, is contrary to Purgatory: and that the prayers for the dead which are at this day made in the Church of Rome, make no mention of the fire of Purgatory.

The booke of Queſtions and Anſwers to the Orthodoxe, which is at the end of *Iuſtine Martyrs* works, ſaith thus in the 75. queſtion: * *After the ſoules are departed out of the body, preſently a ſeparation is made of the good from the bad, for they are carried by Angels to the places fit for them: the ſoules of the good into Paradiſe, where the Angels reſort, and are conuerſant; but the ſoules of the wicked into hell.*

μετὰ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἐξελθεῖν εὐθέως γίνεται τῶν δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων διάκρισις· ἀγόμενοι γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τοὺς ἀξίους τόπους· αἱ μὲν τῶν δικαίων ψυχαὶ εἰς τὸν παράδεισον, αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀδίκων ψυχαὶ εἰς τοὺς ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ τόπους.

Saint *Cyprian* in his booke againſt *Demetrian*: * *This temporall life being ended, we are ſequeſtred into the habitation either of eternall death, or of eternall life.*

* Æui temporalis fine completo, ad æterna vel mortis vel immortalitatis hoſpitia dividimur.

And in the ſame Treatiſe towards the end: a *When we are gone from hence, there is no more place of repentance, nor no fruite or effect of Satisfaction.* And then he addeth: *If thou askeſt pardon of God for thy ſinnes, although it be at the iſſuing of thy ſoule out of thy body, and at the end of this temporall life, pardon ſhall be granted vnto thee vpon repentance and confeſſion of thy ſinnes: and pardon of ſaluation is granted to the beleeuer by diuine grace and goodneſſe, and from death wee paſſe and go into life eternall.*

a *Quando iſtinc exceſſum fuerit, nullus iam locus pœnitentiæ eſt, nullius ſatisfactionis effectus.* Ad immortalitatem ſub ipſa morte tranſitur.

Cyprian throughout his whole booke of Mortalitie expreſly ſpeaketh thereof, where among other things hee ſaith, *God, at thy going out of this world, promiſeth thee immortality and eternall life, and doeſt thou doubt thereof? this is not to know God at all as thou ſhouldeſt.* b There alſo he ſaith, that death is a paſſage or way to eternity; that our brethren which are dead are not loſt, but ſent thither before vs; and that we muſt not put on blacke gownes, ſith our friends haue put on

b *Deum tibi de hoc mundo recedenti, immortalitatem pollicetur atque æternitatem, & tu dubitas? hoc eſt Deum omnino non noſſe.* c *Non exitus, ſed tranſitus, & temporali itinere decurſo, ad æterna tranſgreſſus.*

d Amplectamur diem qui singulos assignet domicilio suo, qui nos istinc eripiet, & laqueis secularibus exutos, Paradiso restituit & regno cœlesti.

white robes. And there speaking of the day of death, he saith, d Let vs embrace that day which putteth euery man in his house, which hauing drawne vs from hence, and vnburthened vs of the snares of this world, putteth vs into Paradise and into the heauenly kingdome.

e Quando anima vinculis laxata corporis, volandi quò velit, siue quò ire compelliur propter tenuitatem substantiæ buerit libertatem, aut ad inferna ducetur, aut certe ad cœlestia sublevabitur.

Saint Hierome vpon the ninth of Amos saith, e When the soule loosed from the bands of this body shall be at liberty, because of the thinnesse or lightnesse of her substance, to fly whither it will, or whither it is constrained to go, then it shall bee carried to hell, whereof it is written, Sinners shall be carried or cast into hell; or else it shall bee lifted vp into the heauenly habitations.

f Can.

In the Romish decree, 13. f Cause, second question, this place of Saint Hierome is alledged: In this world wee know that we can helpe one another by prayers or by counsell; but when we shall come before the Iudgement-seate of Iesus Christ, neither Iob, nor Daniel, nor Noe can pray for any man, but euery man shall beare his owne burthen.

In præsentiarum omnia mihi sunt plena eorum quæ audiui à sapientibus, quæ mihi videntur de morte dicta esse præclarè. Ea enim ipsa mihi videtur esse, quæ sit ab ijs, qui in portum ex longa nauigatione aut in domum ex diuturna peregrinatione recipiunt.

Gregory Nazianzen in the Epitaph vpon his brother Caesarius saith, g I beleeue the words and sayings of the wise, that is, that euery good soule fearing God, being delimered from this body, (which here on earth it hath) and separated from it, is presently admitted to the fruition and contemplation of the good which is reserued for it, and enioyeth admirable pleasure.

h Insipientes mortem quasi summum malum reformidant, sapientes quasi requiem post labore & finem malorum expetunt. i Cùm dies aduenerit, intrepidè ad Abraham patrem nostrum proficiscamur, intrepide pergamus ad illum cœtum iustorum & conuentum. Ibimus ei in ad patres nostros, ibimus ad illos nostræ fidei præceptores, vt etiamsi opera desint, fides opituletur, defendatur hereditas.

Saint Ambrose in the booke of the benefit of death, cap. 8. saith, h Fooles feare death as the principall euill, but wise men desire it, as a rest after their trauels, and end of their euils. And in the second Chapter, speaking of the day of death, he saith, i When that day comes, we go assuredly to our father Abraham, to the assembly of Saints, and to the congregation of the iust For

we

we shall go to our fathers, we shall go to the teachers of our faith, to the end, that although our workes faile vs, our faith may secure vs, and the inheritance be kept for vs. Note these words, *Although our workes faile vs*; that men should not thinke, but that hee speaketh of the most holy, and the most perfect among men.

Epiphanius in his second booke of Heresies, in the 39. Heresie, which is the heresie of the Catharists or Nouatians, saith, *In the world to come after man is dead, there is no more helpe by fasting, no more calling for penance, no more giuing of almes.* And then he addeth, [k] *The barnes are shut vp, the time is accomplished, the combat is ended, the place of the lists is empty, and the crownes are giuen.* And saith, that all this is done when the soule leaueth the body; and a little before he said, There is no more place for almes, nor for penance.

Chrysostome in the second Homilie of *Lazarus*, saith, [l] *While we are here on earth, we haue faire hopes, but as soone as we haue left this world, it is no more in our power to doe penance, nor to vndo or amend that which wee haue committed and done vpon earth.* And in his 75. Homilie vpon Saint *Matthew* hee saith, That penance after death is vnprofitable.

And in his fourth Homilie vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes, speaking of Hymnes and prayers which in his time were said at burials of the dead, he saith, [m] *What signifie these burning tapers, but that we bury the champions of Christ? and these Hymnes or songs, but that we glorifie God, and giue him thankes, because he hath crowned the dead, and deliuered him from all paine and griefe?*

And in his 32. Homilie vpon Saint *Mathew*, hee chideth those which weepe for the dead, [n] *Because* (saith he) *death is an hauen of safety.* And in the same Homilie he saith, *Why doest thou call the poore after the death of thy friend? Why doest thou desire the Priests to pray for him?* Whereunto hee maketh answer himselfe, and saith, *That it is to the end that the dead may obtaine rest, and finde his yoke ease. Thinkest thou* (saith he) *that thou must weepe for these things? Doest*

τόπον ὧν θρηνεῖς καὶ ὀλολύζεις ἔχεν αὐτὸν καὶ μάχη καὶ πλημμέλεια, ὑπὲρ οὗ εἰς λιμένας ἐφθάκαμεν ἐκείνος χειμῶνας αὐτῷ κατασκευάζων.

κεσφέρομεν τὰ τάμεια, καὶ πταλίφωται ὁ χρόνος, καὶ ὁ ἀγὼν ἐτελέσθη, καὶ ἀναιρεῖται τὸ σκάμμα, καὶ ὁ στέφανος ἐδόθη σαν.

[k] ἕως ἂν ἐπαύσατο ἃ μὴ ἐλπίδας ἔχομεν χρηστὰς ἐπέσαν ὁ ἀγὼν κενοῦται λοιπὸν μεταμοίας οὐκ ἔστι, οὐδὲ τόπος ἐλεημοσύνης ἡμῖν ἀπομένει.

[l] τί γέλωτας αἱ λαμπάδες αἱ φαιδραὶ; οὐχ ὡς ἀθλητὰς αὐτοὺς ἐνταφιάζομεν; τί οἱ ὕμνοι, καὶ ἡ δόξα ἣν δοξάζομεν καὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν ὅτι λοιπὸν ἐστεφάνωται τὸν ἀπαλλαγέντα.

[m] λιμὴν εὐδιός ἐστιν ὁ θάνατος.

τί μὴ ταῦτα πενθεῖς, καλεῖς, παρακαλεῖς ἱερεῖς εὔχεσθαι, ἵνα εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν ἔλθῃ, ὁ τίτλος λυτικὸς ἵνα ἀνῇ τὸν ζυγόν. ἆρα

thou

thou not ſet that therein thou doeſt him wrong, raiſing ſtormes againſt him, when he is ſafely arrived at the hauen?

Gregory Noſſen in his booke of thoſe that ſleepe, ſaith, * *The warre that is in vs being ended by death, our ſoules reſt, hauing left the field wherein the battell was fought, that is, the body.* And a little after: *The paines of death are as it were a midwife vnto a man, to bring him into eternall life.* The purging fire whereof he ſpeaketh in the ſame booke, is the fire of the laſt Iudgement, which (according to the opinion of the ancient Fathers) muſt purge all men, yea, and the Virgin *Mary*, as we haue proued before. Sometimes alſo the Fathers call [p] the afflictions of this life, a purging fire: Saint *Cyprian* in the ſecond Epiſtle of his fourth booke, calleth Eccleſiaſticall penance impoſed vpon thoſe which by feare were become Idolaters, a purgation by fire.

Saint *Auguſtine*, or whoſoeuer is the author of the booke of the Vanity of this world, in the ninth Tome, Chap. 1. ſaith, [q] *Know, that when the ſoule departeth out of the body, it is preſently placed in Paradiſe, becauſe of her good works, or is caſt downe into the pit of hell, becauſe of her ſinnes.* And in the margent theſe words are ſet, *Vbi nunc Purgatorium?* And in the ſecond Sermon of the Conſolation of the dead, which is in the ninth Tome of Saint *Auguſtines* works, cap. 1. he ſaith: [r] *The ſoule going out of the body, is receiued by the Angels, and placed in Abrahams boſome, if it be faithfull, or in the infernall priſon of hell, if it be ſinfull.*

In the eighteenth Sermon of the words of the Apoſtle hee ſaith, [t] *There are two habitations, the one in the eternall Kingdome of Heauen, the other in the eternall Fire of Hell.*

And in the 232. Sermon which is againſt Drunkenneſſe, he ſaith, [t] *Let no man deceiue himſelfe, my brethren, for there are two places, and no third place. He that ſhall not merit to raigne with Chriſt in heauen, without doubt ſhall periſh with the diuell in hell.*

In the booke of the Deſert of ſinnes, and of pardon thereof,

* *Per mortem ſoluto bello, quod in nobis eſt, pacem mens agitat. Poſteaquam dolor mortis ad alteram vitam hominibus quaſi obſtetricata fuerit.*

p *Aug. lib. 21. de ciuitate Dei. cap. 13. Nos in hac mortali vita eſſe quaſdam purgatorias panas confitemur.*

q *Scitote quod cum anima à corpore euellitur, aut in Paradiſo pro meritis bonis collocatur, aut certe pro peccatis in inferni tartara præcipitatur.*

r *Recedens anima, ab Angelis ſuſcipitur, & collocatur aut in ſinu Abrahæ, ſi fidelis eſt, aut in carceris inferni cuſtodia, ſi peccatrix eſt.*

t *Duæ ſunt habitationes, vna in igne æterno, altera in regno æterno.* t *Nemo ſe decipiat, fratres, duo enim loca ſunt, & tertium non eſt vllum. Qui cum Chriſto regnare non meruerit, cum diabolo abſque dubitatione vlla peribit.*

cap.

cap. 28. He ſaith, "*There is no middle way, in ſuch manner that he which dwelleth not with Ieſus Chriſt, muſt dwell elſewhere with the diuell.* And it is to be noted, that Saint *Auguſtine* in this place maintaineth, that little children which are not baptized, are in hell. Certainly he would not haue beene ſo hard and rigorous againſt theſe children, if he had knowne of any other place of puniſhment, which is not ſo rigorous, or ſhorter, as *Limbus patrum*, or Purgatory.

" *Nec eſt vllus medius locus vt poſſit eſſe niſi cum diabolo, qui non eſt cum Chriſto.*

Theſe places in this Father ought to be taken for a reſolution of a doubt which he ſometimes had, whether after this life there is any temporall torment and purging fire. And in his Manuell to *Laurentius*, cap. 68. he ſaith, That that fire which proueth euery mans worke, whereof Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 3. 11. ſpeaketh, is the triall of afflictions which is made in this life. And proceeding in that matter in the Chap. following, he ſaith, [x] *It is not a thing incredible that ſuch a thing may happen after this life, and we may doubt whether it be ſuch as may be found, or whether it be an hidden thing, that certaine faithfull perſons ſhall be ſaued by purging fire, ſome ſooner, ſome later, as they loued and affected the things of this world.* He doubteth whether he ſhould beleeue this purgation by fire, which many ancient Fathers referred to the day of Iudgement.

[x] *Tale aliquid etiam poſt hanc vitam fieri incredibile non eſt, & vtrum ita ſit quæri poteſt, & aut inueniri aut latere nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium.*

And in the booke of the eight Queſtions propounded by *Dulitius*, in the firſt queſtion he ſaith, *Whether men ſuffer afflictions onely in this life, or whether after this life ſome ſuch puniſhments enſue, it is not a thing, as I thinke, farre from the apparence of truth.*

Quanto magis minuſve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiuſque ſalutari.

In the 26. Chapter of the one and twentieth booke of the City of God, he ſaith of tranſitory tribulation after this life, *Non redarguo, quia forſan verum eſt: I deny it not, becauſe it may be it is true.*

[y] *Purgatorias autem pœnas nullas futuras opinetur, niſi ante illud vltimum tremendumque Iudicium.*

We haue alſo ſeene before two formall places out of the booke of the City of God, wherein he putteth this purgation to be at the day of Iudgement: but in the 21. booke and 16. Chapter he is of a contrary minde, and ſaith, [y] *That wee muſt beleeue that there are no purging paines, but thoſe that are before the latter Iudgement.* Which makes me beleeue that this

this place hath beene corrupted or thruſt into his booke by malice; and that it is not credible, that this Doctor who in ſo many other places affirmeth the contrary, ſhould be ſo forgetfull, and that in one ſelfe ſame booke he ſhould contradict himſelfe; or that by purging paines he vnderſtandeth the afflictions of this life.

* *Quia auctoritate noſtri gratia redempti ſumus, hoc iam cœleſtis muneris habemus, vt cum de carnis noſtræ habitatione ſubtrahimur, mox ad cœleſtia præmia ducamur.*

We will end this queſtion with an expreſſe ſentence out of Pope *Gregory* the firſt in his 13. booke vpon *Iob*, Chap. 20. where he ſaith, * *Becauſe we are redeemed by the Grace of our Creator, we haue this heauenly gift, that when our ſoules depart out of this fleſhly habitation, we are preſently carried to the reward of eternall reſt.* I know not what may be ſpoken to this purpoſe more expreſly.

Of Indulgences or Pardons.

89. *Salt.* The fire of Purgatory being in this manner quenched, Indulgences or Pardons whereby the Pope draweth ſoules out of this fire, grow cold: In ſuch manner, that the Pope hath no need to heape vp and gather the ſuperabundant ſatisfactions of Saints into his treaſury, to diſtribute them by his pardons, and to conuert them into payment or ſatisfaction for others, and thereby to draw ſoules out of Purgatory. This buſineſſe is altogether ſuperfluous.

For he ſhall not need to trouble himſelfe to take that out of priſon which is not there. And though it were ſo, yet the afflictions and troubles of the Saints whom God hath ſufficiently rewarded in their owne perſons, would not bee an acceptable ſatisfaction. For the Scripture ſaith, Galat. 6. 5. *That euery man ſhall beare his owne burthen.* And 1. Cor. 3. 8. *Euerie man ſhall receiue his wages according to his labour.* And 2 Cor. 5. 10. *Euery man ſhall receiue the things which are done in his body, whether it be good or euill.* And Pſal. 49. 7. *No man can by any meanes redeeme his brother, nor giue to God a ranſome for him.*

As

As alſo that the ſatisfaction of Ieſus Chriſt is ſufficient, without borrowing the afflictions of the Saints, or the faſtings, pilgrimages, and whippings of Monks, 1. Iohn 1. 7. *The bloud of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt cleanſeth vs from all ſinne*: and Acts 4. 12. *There is no ſaluation in any other*. He giueth no vertue to the Saints to pay a debt which is diſcharged, nor to make ſatisfactiō for that for the which he himſelfe hath fully ſatisfied. It is a mocking of the Saints, to ſet them on worke to do a thing which is done before.

If the Pope were bound to yeeld an account of his actions, and to ſhew by what authority he doth that which he doth, could he ſhew in what place God hath giuen him that power to take ſoules out of Purgatory? Secondly, who hath commanded him to heape vp the ſuperabundant ſatisfactions of Saints and Monks in his treaſury? Thirdly, where and when God did firſt command him to diſtribute the to others? I beleeue he would be hardly beſtead: ſeeing that the high Prieſts in the old Teſtament did not gather together the ſuperabundant ſatisfactions of *Noe* nor of *Abraham*, nor made any diſtribution of them: nor neuer thought of taking any ſoules out of Purgatory, either by power of iuriſdiction, or any māner of ſuffrages. Seeing alſo, that neither Ieſus Chriſt, nor the Apoſtles, nor yet the ancient Church for many yeeres neuer ſpake of this treaſure, nor did by Pardons diſtribute the ouerplus of humane ſatisfactions, nor eſtabliſhed priuiledged altars, nor tooke any ſoules out of Purgatory. And *Gabriel Biel* in his 57. Lecture vpon the Canon of the Maſſe, and Cardinall *Caietan* in the beginning of the booke of Indulgences, acknowledge, That in all antiquity there is nothing found touching Pardons.

The abuſe thereof is moſt euident and cleare, in this, that the remiſſion of ſinnes is tyed to a certaine Church, in ſuch manner that he which ſhould elſewhere do three times as many deuotions, ſhould not haue the ſame pardon. And in this, that when the day of Iubile is at Rome, thoſe that are neere thereunto, haue their remiſſion at their eaſe: but thoſe which are three hundred leagues from thence, and want mo-

ney,

ney, or a good horſe, or a good paire of legs, are depriued of that ſpirituall liberality. And herein, that the Pope giueth full pardon of all ſinnes, and a third part of ſinnes beſides, that is to ſay, that he forgiues all their ſinnes, and many other. As alſo herein, that the Pope and the Clergie draw great profits, and vſe a great trafficke thereby. The Iubile is the great harueſt of the Citie of Rome: then offerings and treaſure come thither from all places. And in this, that the Pope giueth pardons without any exact calculation, (as hauing ſecretly reckoned with God) giuing eighteene thouſand yeeres of pardon, and as many times forty dayes, and ſome dayes more: there wanted nothing but houres and minutes. And in this, that he throwes pardons abroad like a handfull of crownes among the preaſe, as when he throwes a thouſand yeeres of pardon among the preaſe of the people vpon the day of his Coronation.

But ſpecially and aboue all, it is an admirable thing, that Ieſus Chriſt mediateth and intreateth for the ſoules that are in Purgatory, and that they come not forth from thence by his interceſſion, but come out by the Popes pardons. Which can neither be blanched nor excuſed by that which ſome ſay, that the interceſſion of Ieſus Chriſt doth not exempt the faithfull from ſickneſſes and other afflictions in this preſent life. For the interceſſion of Ieſus Chriſt ſerueth not to hurt vs: but it ſhould be hurtfull vnto vs, if it depriued vs of the wholeſome remedies which God vſeth to amend vs, which are ſickneſſes and afflictiõs. In which ranke Purgatory is not to be reckoned, which ſerueth not to amend and inſtruct ſinners, and to keepe them in the feare of God. We cannot ſay, that it ſhould be an hurtfull thing to thoſe ſoules not to bee burnt, and to be preſently carried into Paradiſe. Chriſts ſatisfaction exempteth vs from ſatisfying, but depriueth vs not of corrections and wholeſome trials. And the Pope doth not by his pardons exempt men from ſickneſſe, but will haue them to beleeue that he drawes ſoules out of Purgatorie. Wherein he manifeſtly exalts himſelfe aboue God: for if it be Gods will to puniſh his children in a fire, why will not the Pope

ſuffer

ſuffer him to puniſh them as it pleaſeth him? Aske him by what authority he doth that: and he will ſay, That God gaue *Peter* the power to vnbinde and looſe vpon earth. Put the caſe that this were likewiſe ſaid of the Pope, yet that place ſpeaketh not of looſing vnder the earth; the power of the Keyes extendeth not to the dead.

Of Single life, or perpetuall abſtinence from marriage.

To beginne this queſtion, we declare and auouch, that we honour and much eſteeme conſtant virginity, and acknowledge that it hath many aduantages aboue marriage: and that a man which is not married, if he be chaſte and continent, is the fitter to beare the croſſe of Chriſt, and to reſolue with himſelfe to endure baniſhment for the Word of God. For he is leſſe tied and combred with humane cares, and hath more liberty. His mind is leſſe diſtracted by the cares of this preſent life: and he hath more time to employ himſelfe in the Seruice of God. 90. *Sect.*

But theſe praiſes and commendations belong onely to continent and conſtant virginity, which is not onely an integrity of the body, but alſo a purity of ſpirit, voyd of all concupiſcence. Which is a gift that happeneth to a very few men, and may as well be giuen to a Lay-man as to a Paſtor of the Church.

Hieron. lib. 1. cont. Iouinian. Illa virginitas hoſtia eſt Chriſto, cuius nec mentem cogitatio, nec carnem libido maculauit. Ambr. li. 3. de virginib. Non ſola carnis virginem facit, ſed etiam mentis integritas.

This commendation of Virginity ought not in any ſort to preiudice Marriage, ordained by God in Paradiſe, and which Ieſus Chriſt would honor with his preſence: who alſo would be borne of a Virgin, but yet contracted, and vnder ſhadow of marriage, to honor virginity without diſhonouring marriage, inſtituted by God to be a remedy againſt incontinencie, an eaſe of afflictions, a mutuall ſupport, a meanes of the conſeruation of humane kinde, and by conſequence of the Church.

Againſt this marriage the Popes haue banded themſelues, and

and haue inuented a thousand meanes to make it odious. Pope [a] *Innocent* in Distinction 82. forbids those *that dwell carnally with their wiues, to be receiued into any sacred offices, because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy*: as if holinesse were disagreeing with marriage; or as if the commandemẽt to be holy, belonged onely to Ecclesiasticall persons. There also he groundeth single life vpon this place of Scripture, Titus 1. 15. which saith, *Vnto the pure all things are pure, but vnto them that are defiled and vnbeleeuing, nothing is pure.* And vpon that which is said, Rom. 8, 8, 9. *Those that are in the flesh, cannot please God.*

Pope *Syricius* in the same Distinction speaketh thus, [b] *We vnderstand that diuers Priests and Deacons long time since their consecrations haue begotten children, not onely in marriage, but in aduherie.* And a little while after, he calleth both the one and the other [c] *Ringleaders of adultery, and teachers of vices.* Which the Apostle to the Hebrewes did not beleeue, when in the 13. Chapter, verse 4. he calleth marriage, *The bed vndefiled.* Nor *Epiphanius*, when he said, that *Enoch* was not a virgin, and yet he was continent.

Bellarmine in cap. 34. of the booke of Monks, cals the marriage of Monks a Sacriledge, and saith, it is a greater sin then adultery for them to marry. And yet they are not abashed to see a Priest keepe a whore. In Rome the Priests and Prelates go publikely to the Stewes. But if any of them marrie, he is esteemed a monster, and I thinke that he should not scape the Inquisition. So the Popes forbid marriage, and permit adultery. The Iesuite *Emanuel Sa* in his Aphorismes, at the word [d] *Bishop*, maketh no difficulty to say, that whore-hunting is by right permited vnto them.

And although that in the Church of Rome those that are Bigamies, are irregular, that is, that those that haue beene twice married, are not admitted to the Priesthood; yet hee is not irregular that hath had diuers concubines, [e] as Pope

[a] *Can. Propositi. Nec eos ad sacra officia fas sit admittere, qui exercent cum vxoribus carnale consortium, quia scriptum est, Sancti estote quoniam ego sanctus sum.*

[b] *Can. Plurimos.*

[c] *Quisquis ille est sectator libidinum, præceptor vitiorum. Epiphan. Anchorato.* οὐχ ὡς ἦν παρθένος ἀλλὰ ἐγκρατὴς.

[d] *Episcopus potest procedere contra quencunq; ob peccatum mortale, nisi esset iure permissum, vt meretricium.*

[e] *Extra De Bigamis, cap. Quia circa, Postulati per sedem Apostolicam edoceri, si presbyteri plures concubinas haberent, Bigami censeantur. Ad quod duximus respondendum, quod cum irregularitatem non incurrerint Bigamie, cum eis tanquam simplici fornicatione notatis, quod ad executionem sacerdotalis officij poteris dispensare.*

Innocent

Innocent the third declareth. All that is done, for feare leſt married prieſts ſhould diminiſh the goods of the Church to giue them to their children, as Pope * *Gregorie* the firſt ſaith in the 28. Diſtinction. By the like policie where any profit may be procured to the Popes and Prelates, they haue aduanced the dignitie of marriage, placing it amongſt the number of the Sacraments of the Church, thereby to draw the knowledge of matrimoniall cauſes to themſelues, vnder pretence that it belongs to the Church to take knowledge of the Sacraments. And yet forgetting themſelues, they marrie ſome by deputies, which they would find to be abſurd in the other Sacraments, and would not ſuffer any one to be baptized for another.

* *Can. de Syracuſano. Si perſtes vxor aut filij per quos Eccleſiaſtica ſolet peruicilitari ſubſtantia.*

By the ſame policy they haue forbidden marriage in the third and fourth degree, and forged forbidden degrees of ſpirituall parentage; becauſe, the more prohibitions that are made, men come the oftener vnto them for Diſpenſations.

1 Touching this queſtion, If we take the Word of God for iudge herein, the difference will ſoone be ended. For the chiefe Doctors of the Church of Rome confeſſe, that we haue no commandement from God touching the ſame. *Thomas*, & after him *Bellarmine*, in the firſt booke of Clerkes, chap. 18. teach, that the probibition made to ſpirituall perſons not to marrie, is no diuine law, but a humane and poſitiue law; and neuertheleſſe we haue heard before, & experience witneſſeth the ſame, that this humane commandement is inuiolably obſerued, but that adulterie is permitted, and the Stewes eſtabliſhed in Rome by the Popes permiſſion, contrary to the commandement of God.

Thomas 2. 2. Quæſt 88. Art. 11.

2 The Apoſtle, 1. Cor. 7. 2. ſaith, *To auoid fornication, let euery man haue his wife, and euery woman haue her owne husband.* Note, *euery man:* to the end that ſpirituall perſons ſhould not be exempted. And, *to auoid fornication.* Then this commandement is made to ſpirituall perſons ſubiect to fornication.

3 In the ſame Chapter verſe 9. it is ſaid; *But if they cannot abſtaine, let them marrie, for it is better to marrie then to burne.*

An vnchaſt prieſt then that hath not the gift of continencie, is bound to marrie. It ſerues not his turne to ſay, that he hath made a vow not to marrie, and that he muſt obſerue & keepe his vow. For the ſame prieſt hath alſo made a vow not to commit adulterie: and although he had not made that vow, yet he is bound thereunto, ſeeing that God in his Law forbiddeth adulterie. Now, which promiſe is moſt ſtrictly to be obſerued, either that which a man maketh to God to obſerue and obey his commandements, or that which he maketh to the Church, without the commandement of God? Which bond or obligation is the ſtrongeſt, either that which a man oweth to God whether he will or not, or that wherein we willingly binde our ſelues, without any neceſſitie, and without the Word of God? How comes it to paſſe then that the marriage of a Prieſt contrary to an vnneceſſarie vow, is called ſacriledge, but if he committeth adulterie againſt the commandement of God, the fault is eſteemed a thouſand times leſſe? I ſay, that adulterie committed by a prieſt, not onely breaketh his vow made to God to obey his Law, but alſo infringeth the vow of chaſtitie that he made when he was made a prieſt, ſo that he breaketh two vowes. But if he marrie, he breakes but one, & that was made cõtrary to the word of God. So adultery committed by a prieſt is a double ſacriledge, becauſe thereby two vowes are broken.

4 If all men be bound, and that without a vow, to obey God, then prieſts are bound to obey the commandement of God pronounced by the Apoſtle, *If they cannot abſtaine, let thẽ marrie.* Holy, iuſt, and neceſſarie obligations to ſaluation, cannot be broken by neceſſarie ſubſequent vowes.

5 Hereunto I adde, that it is an abuſe here to alledge the vow, not to marrie. For vowes are good, firſt, if we vow good things: ſecondly, if we vow willingly and with knowledge what we do: thirdly, if we vow things which are in our power to do. Now in this vow not to marry, there wanteth theſe three things. Firſt, for that a man that is not continent, voweth neuer to marrie, that is to ſay, that he will vow to diſobey God, that will haue perſons that haue not the gift of conti-

continencie, to marrie. Feeling himselfe not able to containe, he will vow to abstaine from the remedie of incontinencie which God hath ordained. This vow being contrary to Gods will, is of no force, & yet he is constrained to keepe his vow, although he should commit adultery a thousand times.

6 Secondly, this vow also is ordinarily made vnwillingly, & without knowing what it is. Men make their daughters Nunnes at twelue yeeres, and their sonnes Monkes at fourteene yeeres of age, then when they do not know what concupiscence meaneth: which after beginning to kindle in thē, worketh with double force, like cinders that are couered ouer with ashes, & at the last break out violently into a flame. A father to discharge himselfe of his dutie towards his children, putteth the weakest and imperfectest of them into an house of religion, & offereth the maimed and lame vnto God. And those poore children entring ioyfully into the Fishers weele, soone after, at their leisure, sigh and grone in their captiuitie.

7 Lastly, by this vow men promise things which are not in their power: for chastitie is a gift which God bestoweth not vpon many men. The vnchaste life of the most part of those that make this vow, sufficiently sheweth it. To quench naturall affections, we must haue a supernaturall gift, which is not in our power. The Apostle 1. Cor. 7. 7. feeling himselfe to be exempted from these desires, said, *I would that all men were euen as I my selfe am.* But to shew that few haue that gift, he addeth, *But euery man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, another after that.*

8 Whereupon *Bellarmine* confesseth, that this gift is not in our power; yet, that euery man may aske the same of God. But he considereth not that God will not heare our prayers if they be not made in faith, as Saint Iames saith, 1. 6. 7. and also that this faith is a gift of God, Ephesians 2. which gift God giueth not to all men, 2. Thes. 3. 2. As also that he which asketh grace of God not to marrie, hath no promise that God will heare him. It is true that God promiseth to giue vs all things that we shall aske in the name of Iesus Christ: but

Lib. 2. de Monac. cap. 31.

he ſpeaketh of things neceſſarie to ſaluation, of which number perpetuall virginitie is none. And God gaue not that gift to thoſe men whom he loued moſt, as to *Moſes*, to *Samuel*, to *Dauid*, to *Eſay*, &c. But, how ſhould the Prieſts & Clerkes of the Church of Rome be aſſured to obtaine the gift of chaſtitie, which is not neceſſarie to ſaluation, and which God hath not promiſed, ſeeing that they make profeſſion not to be aſſured by prayer to obtaine the ſaluation which God promiſeth? In vowing chaſtitie then, they vow that which God hath not promiſed them, and which they are not aſſured to obtaine, and which is not in their power. Whence it followeth, that this vow is raſhly made, and by conſequence is not to be obſerued.

9 Alſo, we haue examples of the Prophets extraordinarily and miraculouſly inſpired, & indued with the Spirit of God; as *Moſes*, *Samuel*, *Eſay*, &c. which were married and had children. The prieſts alſo in the old Law were married: and that in ſuch a time, when in externall things, and in cleaneneſſe & ceremoniall exactneſſe, God required a greater puritie then he doth vnder the Goſpell. And if marriage had bene vnfit for the prieſts in the old Law, God would haue ordained ſome other meanes to continue the order of prieſts then by ſucceſſion from the father to the ſonne. To this they make no anſwer: for that which they ſay, is no anſwer. They ſay that the prieſts abſtaind from their wiues in the time of their ſeruice. A thing inuented by themſelues, and which cannot be proued. But on the contrary it is found, that *Aaron* and his ſonnes were daily both morning and euening to attend vpon the ſacrifice, and to burne incenſe euery morning, Exodus 30.7. as alſo, that the ordinarie food of the high Prieſt and of his familie, was that portion of the ſacrifices which was allotted vnto them.

10. Neuertheleſſe, put caſe that it were ſo; can abſtinence for a few dayes ſerue or be ſufficient to eſtabliſh perpetuall virginitie? For ſuch an abſtinence did not depriue the prieſts of the end and intent of marriage, which is to beget children, and to preuent incontinencie: but perpetuall ſingle life

deprineth

deprieueth a man of thoſe things, intangleth him in wicked deſires, and reſiſteth nature. Which ſerueth alſo for an anſwer to the like allegations. As is the prohibition made to the Iſraelites not to touch their wiues carnally for the ſpace of three dayes before the publication of the Law. And that which the Apoſtle 1. Corint. 7. 5. ſaith, *Defraud not one another, except it be with conſent for a time, that you may giue your ſelues to faſting & prayer, & againe come together, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinencie.*

11 Many of the Apoſtles alſo were married. In the firſt of Mark. v. 30. mention is made of *Peters* wiues mother. *Ignatius* liuing neere to the Apoſtles time, in his Epiſtle to the Philadelphians, ſaith, [a] *Peter and Paul, and the reſt of the Apoſtles were married.* Saint *Ambroſe* vpon the 11. Chapter of the 2. Corinthians ſaith, [b] *All the Apoſtles except Iohn and Paul, had wiues. Clemens Alexandrinus* in his third of Strom. ſaith, [c] *Do they reiect the Apoſtles? For Peter and Philip begat children. Philip gaue his daughters to husbands. And Paul made no difficultie in one of his Epiſtles, to ſpeake to his companion, being a woman.* Which I alledge: not that I beleeue that Saint *Paul* was married, but to ſhew that *Clement* did not eſteeme marriage to be incompatible with the Apoſtles office. In the 21. Chapter of the Acts, verſe 9. it is ſaid, that *Philip* the Euangeliſt had foure daughters. *Platina* in the life of *Cletus* the firſt ſaith, that Saint *Luke* was married, and that his wife was in Bithynia.

12 Our Aduerſaries anſwer, and ſay, that it is true, that thoſe holy ſeruants of God had wiues, but that they lay not with them, and had not the carnall vſe of their bodies. Theſe men diuine what they liſt, without producing any prohibition made to the Apoſtles touching the ſame. What would the Apoſtles haue thought, when Ieſus Chriſt called them, if he had layd that neceſſitie vpon them to abſtaine from their wiues? Who doubts that the high Prieſts and the Phariſies that ſifted him ſo narrowly, would not haue perſecuted him therefore, as hauing impoſed a yoke vpon them, which God had not ſet downe in his Law? *Defraud not one another*, ſaith

[a] ὡς πέτρος καὶ παῦλος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι τὰς γαμετὰς εἶχον συνοικοῦντες.

[b] *Omnes Apoſtoli, excepto Ioanne & Paulo, vxores habuerunt.*

[c] ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἀποδοκιμάζουσι; πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ φίλιππος ἐγέννησαν παιδοποιήσαντο, &c.

the Apoſtle, *but come together againe*, 1. Cor. 6. 5. If to defraud one another be a vice in other men, why had it been a vertue in the Apoſtles?

13 It is true that the Apoſtles ſaid to Ieſus Chriſt, Math. 19. 27. *We haue forſaken all and followed thee*: To whom Ieſus Chriſt made anſwer and ſaid, verſe 29. *Whoſoeuer ſhall forſake houſes, or brethren, or ſiſters, or father or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my names ſake, he ſhall receiue an hundred fold more, and ſhall inherit eternall life.* But it is a great abuſe, to take that which he ſaith to all the faithfull, as if it were onely ſaid to the Apoſtles and Paſtors of the Church. For he ſaith, *Whoſoeuer ſhall forſake, &c.* All the faithfull ought to forſake houſes, fields, wiues, children, fathers, mothers, yea and their owne liues, when they cannot keepe them but by denying Ieſus Chriſt, or forſaking that vocation whereunto God hath called them. In that caſe God will haue all humane bands broken, and that all naturall affections ſhall in a manner be choked by the zeale and the deſire to ſaue our ſoules, and to follow our vocation. Saint *Auguſtine* in his 89. Epiſtle expoundeth that place in this manner, ſaying: *Sometime there happeneth ſuch a neceſſitie, that we muſt either leaue our wiues, or Ieſus Chriſt.* The place is long, and very expreſſe to this purpoſe, and he ſpeaketh of all the faithfull.

14 It is to be noted alſo, that Ieſus Chriſt there ſpeakes of forſaking wiues, children, houſes, and goods generally. Then ſeeing the Church of Rome doth iudge that by this place Prieſts and Biſhops are not bound to forſake & leaue the vſe of their goods, why ſhould they by the ſame place be bound to leaue the vſe of their wiues? If a father that is become a Prieſt, is not bound by this place to be no more a father, why ſhould he by this place be bound to be no more an husband? If he may keepe his goods, why ſhould he not alſo keepe his wife? for theſe two things are alſo ioyntly ſet downe in this place. And we ſee by the Hiſtory of the Goſpell, that after Ieſus Chriſt had ſaid that to his Apoſtles, they did not leaue the propriety and vſe of their fiſher-boates, nor Saint *Iohn* of his

his houſe, whereinto he receiued the virgin *Marie* after the death of Chriſt our Lord.

15 To be ſhort, touching this matter we haue the expreſſe prohibition of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt ſaying to his Apoſtles, Matthew 19. 9. *No man ſhall put away his wife, except it be for whoredome, &c.* And verſe 6. *The man and his wife are no more twaine, but one fleſh. Let no man therefore put aſunder that which God hath coupled together.* Seeing that the Lord ſpake to his diſciples in that place, with what ſhew can they except them onely from the obedience of that commandement? And if they muſt haue abſtained from their wiues, would they haue kept them with them? this could not haue been without offence. Whither would they haue driuen them away, & ſeparated them from their children, but there would haue been inhumanitie and a publike ſcandall?

16 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* in the firſt to Tim. 4. 1. 2. 3. ſaith, *In the latter times ſome ſhall depart from the faith, and ſhall giue heed vnto ſpirits of error and doctrine of diuels: Which ſpeake lies through hypocriſie, and haue their conſciences burnt with an hot iron, forbidding to marrie, &c.*

To ſhun this place, they ſay, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh againſt other heretickes, which condemned marriage as a wicked and filthy thing in it ſelfe.

Wherunto I anſwer, that there is no prohibitiõ in the word of God which a man may not ſhift off by the ſame meanes. So theeues may diſpence with the Law, which ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not ſteale*, by ſaying, that that is ſpoken againſt thoſe that ſteale without neceſſitie, or that ſteale from their friends, but not to thoſe that ſteale for need, or that rob a ſtranger. So adulterie may be permitted, by ſaying that God forbiddeth women to haue to do with many men, but not to haue a friend in a corner. The Apoſtles words are generall, & without exception cõdemne thoſe Doctors which forbid marriage. When the King by his proclamation maketh a generall prohibition, doth it belong to the ſubiect to make exceptions and reſtraints vpon the ſame, which are not contained in the Proclamation? And without hauing any warrant or declaration

claration of the Kings will touching the ſame? Whoſoeuer brings any exceptions or reſtraints againſt a generall commandemẽt of God, made vnto vs in his word, ought to draw and take his exceptions out of the word of God. If it be euill to condemne marriage as a filthy vncleane thing, it is not much leſſe to condemne it by tyrannie and by ſuperſtition. We may run into one ſelfeſame danger by diuers meanes: one ſelfeſame error may enter & be grounded in mens minds by diuers & ſeuerall reaſons. And I ſee not how thoſe which condemne marriage as being a filthy vncleane thing, can ſpeake of marriage in more odious termes then the Popes *Syricius* and *Innocent* aforeſaid do, which call it a vice, and an impuritie and vncleanneſſe, and eſteeme it to be contrary to holineſſe.

17 The ſame Apoſtle in the 1. Tim. 3. 2. ſaith, *A Biſhop muſt be vnreproueable, the husband of one wife, one that can rule his owne houſe honeſtly, hauing children vnder obedience with all honeſtie: for if any cannot rule his owne houſe, how ſhall he take care of the Church of God?* And in the 12. verſe, *Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife:* and verſe 11. *Likewiſe their wiues muſt be honeſt, not euill ſpeakers, &c.*

To contend and ſtriue about that, is not to diſpute againſt vs, but to giue the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* the lie, vnder a colour of interpreting his words. For you muſt note, that he ſaith not, that the Biſhop *hath been*, but that he *muſt be* the husband of one wife. For if the Apoſtle had vnderſtood that a Biſhop had been the husband of one wife, we muſt by the ſame reaſon ſay, that Saint *Paul* will haue a Biſhop to haue been, but not that he ſhould be, without reproofe. By this meanes the Biſhopricke ſhall be an entry into vice, & an exemption from doing good.

Againe the Apoſtle ordaineth, that their wiues ſhall be honeſt, ſober, and faithfull: he ſpeaketh then of Biſhops and Deacons which haue wiues, and not of thoſe that haue none as being dead, For the Apoſtle inſtructeth not dead women, but inſtructeth Biſhops wiues, leſt that by their vices they ſhould diſhonour their husbands vocation. Pope *Leo* the firſt,

in

in his 85. Epistle vnderstood it so: saying, *The Apostle saith, that we must chuse a Bishop that hath been, or that is, the husband of one wife.*

Dicente Apostolo vt Episcopus ordinetur, quem vnius vxoris virum fuisse aut esse constiterit.

Not that the Apostle esteemeth or placeth marriage to be one of the vertues in a Bishop, or that he forbiddeth a man vnlesse he be married to be made a Bishop. The Apostle onely forbiddeth a Bishop to haue two wiues, for that as then polygamy or the hauing of many wiues together was vsed among the Iewes, as *Iosephus* in the 17. booke of his Antiquities, chap. 1. witnesseth, saying: *It is the manner of our countrie to haue many wiues together; and then Herod had nine wiues.* Saint *Hierome* to *Oceanus* saith the same. *Theodoret* vpon this place saith the same both of the Greekes and the Iewes. Looke also in *Chrysostome* in his 10. Homilie vpon the 1. to Timothie.

πλέιον γαρ ἦν γυνὸς πλεῖον γύναιξὶ συνοικεῖν, ὡ ῥαῖδιν δὲ βασιλεῖ κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος χρόνον συνόντων γενέσθαι γαμετάς.

A man may haue two wiues two wayes, either by keeping two wiues in his house together, or else by putting away his lawfull wife without any cause of adulterie, and marrying with another. For Iesus Christ in Mathew 19. 9. declareth, that marriage cannot lawfully be dissolued, vnlesse it be for adultery. In this latter manner a woman may haue two husbands, if she haue left her first husband, or if she hath been put away without committing adulterie, and is married to another husband. A thing which was common, as Saint *Augustine* in his 89. Epistle, Question 4. declareth. Saint *Hierome* in his Epistle to *Oceanus* saith, That *Fabiola* forsooke her husband. Of which women that loued to change, *Seneca* in the third booke of Benefits, chap. 16. saith, [a] That they reckoned their yeeres, not by the Consuls, but by the number of their husbands. *Cicero* [b] in the eight booke of his familiar Epistles, Epistle 7. speaketh of *Triarius* sister, who without cause made a diuorce with her husband. As also the *Proculeia* of *Martial*:

——*Veterem Proculeia maritum*
Deseris, atque iubes res sibi habere suas [c].

[a] *Illustres quaedam ac nobiles fœminæ, non consulum numero sed maritorum annos suos computant: & exeunt matrimonij causa, nubunt repudij.*

[b] *Soror Triarij diuortium sua causa fecit, nupturæ est Decio Bruto.*

[c] *Vide Sixtum Senensem lib. 6. in expositione 1. Capitis ad Titum Annot. 318. & 325.*

Such were the women which the Apostle 1. Tim. 5. 9. excludeth from hauing any charge of ministring in the Church, saying,

saying, *Let not a widow be taken into the number vnder 60. yeeres old, and that hath been the wife of one husband.* That is to say, that hath not had two husbands together, the one dwelling with her, the other separated by diuorce, whether she sought a diuorce with the first, or whether her husband put her away for adulterie. For you must not beleeue that the Apostle excludeth a widow from ministring in the Church, that hath married againe to another husband after the death of her first husband, seeing that in the same Chapter he commandeth yong widowes to marrie againe. For else he should command them to do a thing which would make them vnworthy to minister in the Church. Whereupon I cannot but be much abashed at a Romish Decree, wherin they permit a Canon to be extant, which saith, that the Apostle spake both against reason and truth, and that by commanding to marrie againe, he permitteth fornication. It is the 31. Cause in the first Distinction, *Hac ratione*. The words are these [a] *By this meanes also the Apostle commanded to marrie againe, because of the incontinencie of men. For according to the Apostles commaundement, it is permitted to take a second wife, but according to the reason of truth, it is meere adultery. But seeing God permitting it, it is done publickly and by licence, he committeth an honest adulterie.* Some [b] being not able to auoyd the force of this so cleare & expresse a place of the Apostle, confesse that then Bishops were married: but that they were constrained to chuse such Bishops, because as then they could not find a sufficient number of men that were not married, to gouerne the Church.

To say so, is to weaken the power of Iesus Christ. For it is certaine, that it was not by constraint, nor for want of other meanes, that he chose his Apostles which were married men, namely Saint *Peter*, seeing he had the hearts of all men in his power, and could inuest the most incapable persons with sufficient graces to the end. And if at this day those onely which are endued with the gift of continencie were admitted into the priesthood, would there, thinke you, be a sufficient number found to fill the places that are voyd?

a *Hac ratione Apostoli præceperunt secundas adire nuptias, propter incontinentiam hominum. Non secundam quidem accipere secundum præceptum Apostoli licitum est, secundum autem veritatis rationem vero fornicatio est. Sed cum permittente Deo publicè & licenter cõmittitur, sit honesta fornicatio.*

b The Iesuite Baile Quest. 23. of his Catechisme.

18 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 9. 5. ſaith thus, *Haue we not power to leade about a wife being a ſiſter, as well as the reſt of the Apoſtles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?*

Bellarmine after others ſaith, that Saint *Paul* by a wife that is a ſiſter, vnderſtandeth not a wife which is ioyned vnto a man by marriage, but a wife to ſerue them neceſſarily in the way, & to ſupply their wants. Such as the women were that followed Ieſus Chriſt, who hauing been healed by him, did miniſter to him of their ſubſtance, Luke 8. 2, 3.

But Pope *Leo IX.* (who by the prerogatiue of his ſeate hath the gift not to erre) in the 31. Diſtinction of the Canon *Omnino* declareth, that by *a wife that is a ſiſter*, is vnderſtood a wife married to an Apoſtle, from whoſe carnall company neuertheleſſe he abſtained, although he tooke her with him. And the gloſſe of the Doctors thereupon ſaith, *Ducebant vxores ſecum vt ſeruirent eis in tibis parandis*: They tooke their wiues with them, to ſerue to dreſſe their meate. And *Tertullian*, although he were a Montaniſt, & an enemy to marriage, in his eighth chapter of the booke of Chaſtitie, ſaith thus againſt himſelfe: *Licebat & Apoſtolis nubere, & vxores circumducere: licebat & de Euangelio viuere.* It was permitted to the Apoſtles to marrie, & leade their wiues about with them, & to liue of the Goſpell.

Omnino conſtemur non licere Epiſcopo vxorem abijcere à cura ſua. Sed vt ei victũ & veſtitum largiatur, ſed non vt cum ea carnaliter ex more iaceat. Sicut ſanctos Apoſtolos legimus egiſſe, beato Apoſtolo dicente: Nunquid non habemus poteſtatem mulierem ſororem circũducendi?

Reaſon it ſelfe without any other proofe ouerthroweth *Bellarmines* expoſition. For ſuch women could not haue followed the Apoſtles honeſtly & without ſuſpition. Thoſe women that followed Ieſus Chriſt, might do it without abandoning or leauing their families: for the way which they went was ſhort, and not aboue 30. leagues, which is the diſtance from Galile to Ieruſalem, whereunto Ieſus Chriſt went to the ſolemne feaſt. But to go out of their countrie, to paſſe ouer the Seas, to go a thouſand or twelue hundred leagues with the Apoſtles, was a thing which an honeſt woman neither could nor ought to do: and which naturall affection towards her familie would not haue permitted. They would rather haue paid the charges of ſome ſeruants to haue followed the Apoſtles in their iournies.

The

The Apoſtles words take away all difficultie: for ſuch women would haue followed the Apoſtles by charitie, and not by any power which the Apoſtles had ouer them: for the Apoſtle ſaith: *Haue I not power to leade about a wife being a ſiſter?* He would rather haue ſaid in the plurall number: *Haue I not power to leade about women being ſiſters?* For ſuch duties of charitie and domeſticall ſeruices are more eaſily & honeſtly performed by diuers women.

19 Among many meane obiections of our aduerſaries, I ſee but one that hath any ſhew or colour. The Apoſtle, 1. Tim. 5. 11, 12. ſaith, *But refuſe the yonger widowes, for when they haue begun to wax wanton againſt Chriſt, they will marrie, hauing damnation, becauſe they haue broken their firſt faith.* In this place the Apoſtle ſpeakes of certaine widowes which then tooke the charge vpon them of miniſtration or being ſeruants to the Church, to releeue the ſicke, and to ſuccour the poore. Thoſe women entring into that charge voluntarily, promiſed to end their dayes in that holy ſeruice. But it fell out ſo, that ſome of them altered their purpoſe, either by becomming harlots and wanton againſt Chriſt, (as the Apoſtle ſaith) or elſe by marrying againe. Whereby being vnder the power of an husband, they had no more libertie to continue in that charge which they had taken vpon them in the Church. For which cauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, that they are to be condemned or reproued for hauing violated that faith and promiſe which they had made to the Church, to perſeuere in the ſeruice of the poore and ſicke perſons. Which to preuent, the Apoſtle forbiddeth yong women to make ſuch promiſes as might hinder them from marrying, and will haue *yong widowes to marrie and bring forth children*, verſe 14. And forbiddeth to receiue or admit any widow into the adminiſtration of the Church, which is leſſe then 60. yeeres old, verſe 9. at which time the vow of not marrying would be ridiculous. So that this place being well vnderſtood, is contrary to the vow of not marrying, ſeeing that he forbiddeth yong widowes to do it, and will haue none but old women of 60. yeeres of age and not vnder, to be receiued into a charge

charge which disagreeth with marriage. Which is farre from prohibiting notorious incontinent Clerks from marriage, as at this day they do.

I need not aggrauate the filthinesse of their constrained single life, nor the vices as well naturall as contrary to nature, which thereby haue crept in among those that make profession thereof. The same Prelates which preach continencie, liue incontinently, As they liue, so they dispute against nature, and burning in wicked and euill desires, make a promise to God, not to vse tho'e remedies against them which he ordaineth in his Word. The Pope which forbiddeth Priests to marrie, for a recompence hath opened the Stewes for them, and by order and publicke authoritie hath permitted fornication. Which drew this true confession from Pope *Pius* the second, that *for great causes Priests wiues were taken from them, but that for greater causes they ought to be restored vnto them againe*; as *Platina* in the life of the said Pope sheweth.

Of the Difference of meates.

Arnovx.

I thought not to haue proceeded any further, but that these Ministers producing no place of Scripture for their Article, I determined to set downe a number of places whereof their books are full, for a proofe of euery one of these points. But for that the places noted in the margent of this Article, are distinctly set downe against abstinence from meates, I am content onely to produce this place, Act. 15. 28. *For it seemed good vnto the Spirit & to vs, that you should abstaine from bloud & from things strangled. Did this counsell proceed from Satans forge? And may not the same Spirit by the Church prescribe fasting and abstinence from meates for some good end?* 91. Sect.

Movlin.

The holy Scripture commandeth fasting, and recommendeth it vnto the faithfull, but yet ordaineth no certaine dayes to fast, as Saint * *Augustine* in his 86. Epistle saith.

* *Quibus diebus non oportet ieiunare, & quibus oportet, præcepto Domini aut Apostolorum non ieiunio cessatum.*

1. Touching

1 Touching the diſtinction of meates, and the forbidding to vſe certaine kinds of meates, the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* expreſly condemneth it, 1. Tim. 4. 1. where he calleth forbidding of meates, *a doctrine of diuels.*

They thinke to auoide this, by ſaying that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not of thoſe who abſtaine from certaine meates with humilitie & to tame their fleſh: but of thoſe that eſtremed meates to be polluted and abominable. That was long ago the pretence of thoſe to whom the Apoſtle ſpake, and which in his time erred in that point, ſaying, *Eate not, touch not, taſte not*, as the Apoſtle, Coloſſ. 2. 20. ſaith, *Why, as though you liued in the world, are ye burthened with traditions? as, touch not, taſte not, handle not, which all periſh with the vſing, and are after the commandements and doctrines of men?* Then he addeth that which made the prohibition of meates (to thoſe that forbade it) to ſeem plauſible, ſaying, *Which things haue indeed a ſhew of wiſdome in voluntarie religion and humbleneſſe of minde, and in not ſparing the body, not in any honour to the ſatisfying of the fleſh.* This is iuſtly the words and allegations of our Aduerſaries, and the ends for which they ordaine and eſtabliſh the diſtinction of meates, which neuertheleſſe the Apoſtle reiecteth, calling them commandements and doctrines of men. It makes no difference whether he ſpeaketh to the Iewes or to the Gentiles, ſeeing that generally he condemneth thoſe that abſtaine from meates with humilitie and by exerciſe.

Such alſo was the [a] excuſe of *Tertullian* a Montaniſt, in his booke *contra Pſychicos*: for ſo he called true and faithfull Chriſtians, becauſe they faſted not enough, and as often as he would haue them, and abſtained not from fleſh and liquid things, and would haue faſtings to be free at mens choice; and againſt him obiected this place of the Apoſtle, which putteth the prohibition of meates among the doctrines of diuels. To whom this Montaniſt anſwereth thus, and ſaith in his 15. chapter, *The Apoſtle condemneth thoſe which commanded to abſtaine from meates.* [b] *But it is becauſe the holy Spirit, by his wiſedome and fore-ſight, condemned thoſe hereticks*

[a] *Aduerſus Pſychicos.*

[b] *Reprobat etiam illos qui iubebant cibis abſtinere, ſed de prouidentia Spiritus ſancti præadmanens iam hæreticos perpetuam abſtinentiam præceptures ad deſtruenda & deſpicienda opera Creatoris.*

tickes before they came, that would command a perpetuall abſtinence, to deſtroy and deſpiſe the workes of the Creatour. And againe: [c] *We abſtaine from meates which we reiect not, but ſurceaſe from the vſe of them for a time.* And a little after he ſaith, [d] *The Apoſtle accuſed certaine correctors and forbidders of meates, which abſtained from them with diſdaine, and not of duty.*

[c] *Abſtinentes ab eis quæ non reiicimus ſed differimus.*

[d] *Ita ſciebat quoſdam caſtigatores & interdictores victus incuſare, qui ex faſtidio, non qui ex officio abſtinentur.* [d] οὐκ ἀυθαδείας ἕνεκα ἀλλὰ τῆς κατὰ θεὸν ἀσκήσεως εἰσηγήσατο τοῦτο.

Such was the excuſe of *Euſtachius* Biſhop of Sebaſtia in Armenia, as *Sozomenus* ſaith in the 13. chapter of his third booke, in the Preface of the Councell of Gangres, which is found in the Greek Canons publiſhed by *Du Tillet*. In which Councell this *Euſtachius* being reproued becauſe he had introduced certaine diſtinctions of meates & apparell, he excuſed himſelfe, & ſaid, * That *he had not introduced thoſe things vpon a preſumptuous opinion, but as an holy diſcipline, according to godlineſſe.*

And if we would be ouer-rigorous herein, we could not want prooſes good ſtore, to let you ſee how the Church of Rome hath trauelled and laboured to make certaine meates abominable among Chriſtians. For Pope *Gregorie* the ſecond, in an Epiſtle to *Boniface* Archbiſhop of Ments, [e] commandeth to ſuppreſſe thoſe, & to force them to do penance, which had eaten wilde or domeſticall horſes: *For that* (ſaith he) *is vncleane and execrable.* And *Zacharias* his ſucceſſour writing to the ſame *Boniface*, forbiddeth Chriſtians to eate Iayes, Crowes, Storkes, Beauers, Hares, and wilde Horſes. And I cannot imagine to what end that cuſtome is vſed, to carry meate into the Church before Eaſter to coniure it, if it be not thereby to take away the pollution, or to driue away the diuell from it.

[e] *Agreſtem Caballum aliquantos adiunxiſti comedere, pieroſque & domeſticum. Hoc nequaquã fieri deinceps ſanctiſſime frater ſiaas, ſed quibus poteris modis per omnia compeſce, & dignam eis indicit pœnitentiam: immundũ enim eſt & execrabile.*

2 The ſaid Apoſtle in the ſame chapter, 16. verſe, ſaith, *Let no man therefore condemne you in meate and drinke, or in reſpect of an holy day, or of the new Moone, or of the Sabbath dayes.* Then why doth the Church of Rome condemne vs for not obſeruing their prohibitions of meates, and for not keeping thoſe holy dayes which they ordaine?

3 The ſaid Apoſtle in 1. Cor. 10. 25, ſaith, *Whatſoeuer is*

ſold

ſold in the ſhambles, eate ye, & aske no queſtion for conſcience ſake; for the earth is the Lords, and all that therein is. If any of them which beleeue not call you to a feaſt, and if you will go, whatſoeuer is ſet before you, eate, asking no queſtion for conſcience ſake. What can be more expreſſely ſaid? The Church of Rome eſteemeth vs to be heretikes, & placeth vs among the ranke of Infidels. Now if we ſhould bid one of the Church of Rome to a dinner or ſupper, would he eate of all things that ſhould be ſet before him vpon a fiſh or faſting day? would he without ſcrupuloſitie eate of euery thing there?

4 But is it credible that Ieſus Chriſt hath by the Goſpell aboliſhed the diſtinctions of meates in the Law of *Moſes*, to eſtabliſh other diſtinctions, and to make prohibitions that are a thouſand times more troubleſome? and for one faſting day that was vnder the Law, to eſtabliſh fiftie vnder the Goſpell?

5 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 8. 8. ſaith, *Meate maketh vs not acceptable to God, for neither if we eate, haue we the more, neither if we eate not, haue we the leſſe.* And Rom. 14. 17. *The kingdome of God not meate nor drinke, but righteouſneſſe, & peace, and ioy in the holy Ghoſt.*

And generally of all ſuch obſeruations, Saint *Paul*, 1. Tim. 4. 8. ſaith, *For bodily exerciſe profiteth little, but godlineſſe is profitable vnto all things, which hath the promiſe of the life preſent, and of that that is to come.*

All this which is ſaid before, is not ſpoken to condemne faſting, nor the obſeruation of Eccleſiaſticall faſts, ordinarie or extraordinarie; onely we ſeeke to take away and aboliſh the opinion of merits & ſatisfactions thereby. And we make faſting to conſiſt in abſtinence and ſobrietie, and not in diſtinction of meates, commanded by a man to whom God hath not giuen that power, and that vnder pretence of abſtinence eſtabliſheth his Empire, and layeth a yoke vpon mens conſciences contrary to the Word of God. Likewiſe we condemne not him, who to qualifie the motions and prouocations of his deſires or concupiſcences, abſtaineth from wine or from certaine meates; ſo that his faſting be voluntarie,

and

and not ſcrupulous, nor with opinion of merit or ſatisfaction, nor by command vſurped ouer him by any man. Such was *Daniels* faſt, abſtaining from wine, fleſh, and pleaſant bread, *Daniel* 10. 3. for there was no law in Iſrael touching ſuch abſtinence.

Therefore it is in vaine here to make diſcourſes in the praiſe of faſting and of ſobrietie, which we know to be the nurſes of vertues, guardians of chaſtitie, and prouocations to watchfulneſſe. In the compoſing of mans bodie, God placed the braines farre from the belly, to the end that the kitchin of the bodie ſhould be far from the Study, and that the fauor of meates ſhould not interrupt meditation. For nothing more troubleth holy cogitations then the tumult of concupiſcences, ſtirred vp and kindled by drunkennes or gluttonie. Nothing is harder to be brought to the feare of God, then a man who better reliſheth ſweete ſauces then wholeſome inſtructions, and hath a better palate then braine. Therefore the Scripture oftentimes ioyneth faſting with praier, that prayer might ſanctifie faſting: and that faſting might kindle prayer. So *Anna*, Luke 2. 37. and *Cornelius*, Acts 10. 4. ſerued God in faſtings and prayers. And Ieſus Chriſt telleth vs of a certaine kinde of ſpirits, which are not driuen out but by faſting and prayer, *Matt.* 17. 21.

The ancient Chriſtians were much giuen to this exerciſe, abſtaining from lawfull things, that they might the eaſier auoyd vnlawfull things. They ſought to make diuers neceſſarie things to become ſuperfluous vnto them, whereas to thoſe that are voluptuous, ſuperfluous things become neceſſarie.

But the Church of Rome hath changed this exerciſe into a ſcrupuloſitie, and this abſtinence into a diſtinction of meats, which are more carefully obſerued then the Law of God. For adultery, fornication, murder, and periurie, ordinarie prieſts giue abſolutions: but he that confeſſeth that he hath eaten fleſh in an Ember weeke, is ſent to a Penitentiarie, becauſe the abſolution of ſo great a ſinne is not in the power of ordinarie prieſts.

He that hath neuer ſo little taſted of fleſh in Lent, hath broken the faſt, but not he that hath filled his gorge with fiſh and banquetting ſtuffe, &c. And the number of theſe obſeruatiue faſts are ſo great, that they almoſt take vp ſixe moneths in the yeere. Faſting that ſhould be an exerciſe of humilitie, is become an occaſion of pride, and an opinion of merit and of ſatisfaction: not onely for him that faſteth, but alſo for others. *Bellarmine* in his ſecond Booke of good workes, chap. 11. goeth about to proue that faſting is ſatisfaction for ſinnes, and meritorious for life eternall. And Cardinall *Tolet*, in his ſixt booke of the Inſtruction of Prieſts, ſaith, that faſting is *ſatisfactio pro pœnis peccatorum*, that is, a ſatisfaction for paines due for ſinnes: which ſatisfaction he ſaith to be meritorious for grace, and an augmentation of glory. Faſting ſhould ſerue for a confeſſion of ſinnes, but at this day it ſerueth to eſtabliſh merits, according to the example of the Phariſie, which boaſted of his faſting before God, and therefore was reiected, Luke 18. 12. How pleaſing a prayer do you thinke it would be vnto God, if a man ſhould ſay, Lord, I haue deſerued life eternall, for I haue not dined? Or why ſhouldeſt thou puniſh me for my ſinnes, ſeeing I haue ſatisfied for them, by abſtaining from eating of egges and cheeſe? Yet this is but a ſmall matter, for it is ſaid that ſome faſt oftener then they ſhould do to ſatisfie for their ſinnes, and ſo there is a ſuperabundance in their ſatisfaction. Then God owes them ſomething which he is to returne back againe, that that ſurpluſage might ſerue for others. And eating nothing but fiſh, a man may ſatisfie for others. Thereupon *Tolet* ſaith, * If I faſt for foure perſons, I ſatisfie as much for euery one of them, as if I faſted but for one. See the Canon *Anime*, in the 13. Cauſe, ſecond Queſtion. And to fill vp the meaſure of this abuſe, faſtings are redeemed by mony, as it is ſaid in the Diſtinction 82. in the Canō *Preſbyteri*. And in the Gloſſe vpon the ſame Canon, he may giue a penny to redeeme or buy out the faſt. For certainly he muſt of force be light of beliefe, that beleeueth that God deliuereth a man out of Purgatory, becauſe his neighbour did not dine. If the faſtings of liuing men refreſh the dead, then feaſts made

* *De inſtructione ſacerdotali, lib. 2. cap. 8. Si ieiuno pro quatuor, non minus prodeſt ad ſatisfactionem ſingulis, quàm vnus prodeſſet ſi pro vno tantum ieiunaſſem.*

made by thoſe that are aliue muſt alſo burne the dead.

I confeſſe that God oftentimes granteth his aide and deliuerance to thoſe that faſt: but it is a great abuſe, to attribute that to the merit of faſting, which is granted to faith and to prayer which ſanctifieth the faſt, without which, faſting is either a diet for ſicke perſons, or a want to thoſe that are hungry, or an hypocriticall abſtinence. Faſting ſerueth to obtain, and not to ſatisfie.

To couer this abuſe, *M. Arnoux* onely addeth a place out of the 15. of the Acts, where the Apoſtles aſſembled together in Councell in Ieruſalem, commanded the Gentiles that were conuerted to the faith, to abſtaine from bloud and from things that are ſtrangled. But the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* which was at that Councell, & knew the Apoſtles meaning, taketh away that defence, 1. Cor. 10. 27. where he ſaith, *If any of them which beleeue not, call you to a feaſt, and if you will go, whatſoeuer is ſet before you, eate, asking no queſtion for conſcience ſake.* Now it might be that in infidels houſes they ſerued ſtrangled fowles vpon the table, or ſomething wherein there was bloud. Shewing thereby that ſuch prohibitions were made, to the end that the Gentiles ſhoud not giue offence to the Iewes then newly conuerted to the profeſſion of Chriſt, and by little and little to bring them thereunto, and to burie the legall ceremonies with honour. Now the Apoſtle hauing planted the Goſpell in Corinth, Acts 18. and after going to Philippi, from thence wrote to the Corinthians: whereby it appeareth, that Saint *Paul* wrote that Epiſtle long time after that Councell was holden in Ieruſalem, ſpoken of in Acts 15.

Diuers ancient Churches hauing not well conſidered thereon, moſt exactly obſerued abſtinence from bloud and things that were ſtrangled, as * *Tertullian* in the ninth Chapter of his Apologie witneſſeth. The Councel of Gangres in the ſecond Canon ſpeaketh of bloud, and things that are ſtrangled, as of things eſteemed to be vnlawfull. The ſame prohibition is found in the 67. Canon, of the ſixteenth Councell aſſembled in the palace of Conſtantinople. The like alſo

* *Ne animalium quidem ſanguinem in epulis eſculentis habemus.*

is found in the Coūcels of Wormes and of Orleans. But Saint *Augustine*, better instructed in the holy Scriptures, explaineth this point in the 32. booke against *Faustus*, cap. 13. saying: The * Apostles to accōmodate themselues to the time, chose an easie thing, wherein the Gentiles should conioyntly obserue something with the Israelites. And after addeth, What Christian is there, who at this time will obserue the not touching of Thrushes, or other little birds, whose bloud hath not bene shed? and a few persons that make scruple of these things, are mocked by others. The Church of Rome is of the same iudgement, knowing well that the Apostles established those prohibitions for a time, and not for a perpetuall rule. But she is much to be condemned herein, for hauing, in stead of those two prohibitiōs, established many other more grieuous. Certainly, if the Christian Church had need of any obseruations touching the distinction of meates, it were much better to haue reuiued the abstinences obserued in the Apostles time, rather then to forge a multitude of others, a thousand times more painfull, and contrary to the practice of the Apostles and of Iesus Christ himselfe, who in the weeke before Easter vsually did eate the Paschall Lambe.

* *Elegisse mihi videntur Apostoli pro tempore rem facilem, in qua cum Israelitis Gentes aliquid communiter obseruarent. Quis iam hoc Christianus obseruat, vt turdos vel minutiores auiculas non attingat, nisi quarum sanguis effusus est? Et qui fortè pauci ista tangere formidant, à cæteris irridentur.*

THE XXV. ARTICLE.

Because we do not enioy Iesus Christ but by the Gospell, we beleeue that the order of the Church which hath bene established by his authority, ought to be sacred and inuiolable, and that therefore the Church cannot consist, vnlesse there be Pastors which haue the charge to teach, who ought to be honoured and reuerenced when they are duly called thereunto, and faithfully execute their offices. Not that God is tied to such inferior aides or meanes, but because it pleaseth him to hold vs vnder such a charge and bridle.

dle. Wherein we deteſt all fantaſticall perſons, who as much as in them lyeth, would annihilate the Miniſtery, and the preaching of the Word of God and Sacraments.

THE XXVI. ARTICLE.

We beleeue, that no man ought to withdraw himſelfe from it, nor to content himſelfe with himſelfe, but that all men together ought to keepe & entertaine the vnity of the Church, ſubmitting themſelues to the common inſtruction, and to the yoke of Ieſus Chriſt; & that whereſoeuer God ſhall haue eſtabliſhed a true order of the Church, although Magiſtrates & their ordinances be contrarie thereunto, and that all thoſe that ioyne not therewith, or ſeparate thẽſelues there-from, doe impugne the ordinance of God.

M. Arnoux finds nothing in theſe two Articles to carpe at.

THE XXVII. ARTICLE.

Of the Church.

Neuertheleſſe we beleeue, that it is neceſſarie for vs carefully & with great prudence to diſcerne which is the true Church, becauſe the title thereof is by many falſly vſurped. We ſay therefore (according to the Word of God) that it is the aſſembly of the faithfull, which agree and conſent to follow the ſame word, & the pure religion which dependeth thereon, & which

profit therein all the time of their liues, increasing and strengthening themselues in the feare of God, & proceeding forward in godlinesse; who though they striue neuer so much forward, yet they haue neede to pray for the remission of their sinnes. Howbeit we deny not but that among the faithfull there are hypocrites and reprobates, whose wickednesse cannot take away the name of the true Church.

ARNOVX.

92. Sect. *It is to put the Church cleane out of sight, when they giue it those markes which are as much or more obscure, and lesse easie to be knowne then the Church it selfe: describing it by those signes which betweene vs and them are specially in controuersie: that is, to whom belongeth pure religion, & who is the Possessor of the word. Wherein they fall into the vice or fault of the circle so much blamed in Logicke, as if they should say, Which is the true Church? That which hath pure religion. Which is pure religion? That which is in the Church. By this I know no more then I did before. Which is Peter? It is Blistry. Which is Blistry? It is Peter. This is the circle wherein they courtly hold themselues, against those that with reason blame them for being gone out of the Church by the gate of apparences & shewes of the Word of God.*

Of the word Church, and the diuers significations thereof.

MOVLIN.

Our aduersary fats himselfe with the question of the visibility, and of the markes of the Church, with most pleasing eloquence, and such as serueth onely for quicke spirits. To looke better into this matter, it is necessary for vs to vnfold the ambiguitie of the word *Church*.

The word *Church*, is a Greeke word, which signifieth an assembly,

assembly, and which belongeth as well to the assemblies of infidels as of the faithfull. In the 26. Psalme, verse 5. according to the vulgar translation it is said, *I haue hated the Church of euill doers.* And Acts 19. 32. the assembly of the Pagans crying, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*, is called the Church. Vse hath brought in a custome, that the assemblies of Christians are called Churches, & thereby were distinguished from the Synagogues of the Iewes, although these two words haue all one signification.

Odium Ecclesiam malignantium.

Then to restraine our selues to the sence wherin this word *Church* is taken among Christians, I say, that this word *Church* in the Scripture is taken diuers wayes. Sometimes the Church is taken for the whole body and assembly of the elect and those that are predestinated to saluation, whereof some are already triumphant in heauen, others militant here on earth, the rest not yet borne, but in the counsell of God are enrolled and registred to fight in Gods warre in future time, and ordained to obtaine the victorie. Saint *Peter* in his 1. Epistle 2. 9. calleth it *a chosen generation.* And because the Scripture saith, that the elect are written in the booke of life, and that their names are written in heauen, the Apostle, Hebr. 12. 32. calleth it, *The assemblie and congregation of the first borne, which are written in heauen.* This Church by the Apostle is often called the body of Christ, and by consequence, false, hypocriticall, & prophane Christians are no part thereof: for the body of Iesus Christ hath no dead members, nor men cast off by God, as Saint *Augustine* in Chap. 21. of his second booke against *Cresconius* teacheth. And in his 5. Booke, Chap. 27. of Baptisme, he saith, * That the same Church which is spoken of in the Canticles, the garden enclosed, that sister & spouse, &c. *is the number of the righteous, which are called according to Gods decree, of whom it is said, The Lord knoweth who are his.* For he that is a member of the body of Christ, cannot be a member of the diuell. This Church is the spouse of Iesus Christ, to the which he hath ioyned himselfe, that he might make it a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle, to the end, that it should be holy and vnreproueable, Ephes. 5. 27.

Iam in corpore Christi non sunt quod est Ecclesia, quoniam non potest habere Christus membra damnata.

* *Numerus ergo ille iustorum, qui secundum propositum vocati sunt, de quibus dictum est, Nouit Dominus qui sui sunt, ipse est bortus conclusus, &c.*

§. 27. Thoſe that are of this Church, as long as they are here on earth, are viſible as they are men, but not as they are elected, for election is not diſcerned by the eye, but is charitably preſumed vpon by the profeſſion of faith, and by good works. Out of this Church there can be no ſaluation.

Somtimes by the word *Church* the Scripture vnderſtandeth all the aſſemblie of thoſe that make profeſſion to be Chriſtians. That is the vniuerſall viſible Church, which is compoſed of diuers particular Churches; as in the the Apoſtles time, the Churches of Corinth, Rome, Theſſalonica, and the ſeuen Churches ſpoken of in the 2. and 3. of the Apocalips. Of theſe particular Churches ſome are purer then others, and ſome ſo impure, that in them a man cannot be ſaued, ſpecially when idolatrie is maintained, and the doctrine of the benefit of Chriſt wholly corrupted therein.

This vniuerſall viſible Church is that which the Apoſtle, 1. Tim. 3. 14. calleth, *the pillar and ground of truth*, becauſe the dutie thereof is, to vphold and maintaine the diuine truth againſt all thoſe that ſeeke to corrupt and ſuppreſſe the ſame. Which alſo is the duty of euery particular Church. And is no particular Church which is found in faith, but it is a pillar and ground of the truth.

When we ſay, that out of this vniuerſall viſible Church there is no ſaluation, we vnderſtand that no man can be ſaued which ſeparateth himſelfe from the communion of the vniuerſall Church, & liueth apart, without ioyning himſelfe to any flocke. Neuertheleſſe, if any man ſhould be excluded out of the communion of the Church by an vniuſt excommunication, or if any man ſeeking to become a Chriſtian, and beleeuing in Ieſus Chriſt, is preuented by death before he can be baptized, we doe not beleeue that ſuch a man is excluded from ſaluation. So that as well by our Confeſſion, as alſo by that of our aduerſaries, in this maxime (that out of the viſible Church there is no ſaluation) there are ſome exceptions to be made.

Touching particular Churches, there is not one of them, whereof (to be ſaued) we muſt neceſſarily be a member. If the

the Church of Rome were without error, yet a man might neuertheleſſe be ſaued out of her. Thoſe that ſhall liue in other particular Churches where the Goſpell is purely preached, ſhall not be without ſaluation, although they had neuer heard of the Romiſh Church, becauſe it is but a particular Church.

Beſides theſe three ſignifications of the word *Church*, the Scripture ſometimes vnderſtandeth the people to be the Church, without comprehending the Paſtors of the Church therein, as when Paſtors are commanded to feed the Church, Acts 20. 28.

Sometimes alſo by the word *Church*, the Paſtors onely are vnderſtood, as in theſe words, *Tell the Church*, Matth. 18. 17. For Ieſus Chriſt will haue the partie offended to go to the Paſtors of the Church, to take vp the matter.

The concluſion of all this is, that the word *Church* in the Scripture is taken:

1 Sometime for all the aſſemblie of the elect.
2 Sometime for the vniuerſall viſible Church.
3 Sometime for a particular Church.
4 Sometime for the people onely.
5 Sometime for the Paſtors onely.

Theſe diuers ſignifications of the word *Church*, are neceſſarie to be remébred, for that in the ambiguitie of the word the errour lieth hidden, and ſlippeth into it like a ſnake into brambles & briers. And our aduerſaries expreſly ſtudying to confound this matter, take all thoſe 5. ſignifications for one, & as often as the Scripture ſpeaketh of the Church, they will alwaies haue it to be vnderſtood of the Church of Rome. Sometimes alſo by the Church they vnderſtād the Pope onely, as Pope *Innocent* the third did, who attributed the controuerſie betweene *Philip Auguſtus* King of France, & *Iohn* King of England, to belong vnto himſelfe, becauſe in the Goſpell it is ſaid, *Dic Eccleſiæ*. In the chapter, *Nouit. Extra. de Iudicijs*. And Cardinal *Bellarmine* in the ſecond book of Councels, 19. chap. ſaith, *The Pope ſhould tell it to the Church, that is, to himſelf*.

But ſpecially in the queſtion which *M. Arnoux* propoun-

derb

deth touching the visibilitie of the Church, these distinctiõs are necessarie, to the end that when men speake of the visible Church, they should not produce those places of Scripture that speake of the Church of the elect, which is not discerned by the eye. To the end also that when we speake of the iudgements and decisions of the Church assembled together, we should not speake of the Church of the elect, which is neuer assembled to decide any causes. And to the end likewise that no particular Church should call it selfe vniuersall, as if all the rest were nothing, or were no Churches but by her permission.

So when men aske which are the markes of the true Church, our intent is not to speake of the Church of the elect, which hath no marks discernable by the eye. *God knoweth who are his*, 2. Tim. 2. 19. *He sealeth them by his Spirit vnto the day of redemption*, Ephes. 4. 30. and giueth them *the white stone* spoken of in Reuelation, 2. 17. which is the testimonie of *the Spirit of adoption, which witnesseth with our spirits, that we are the children of God*, Rom. 8. 16. But this witnesse is secret, and not exposed to the sight of man.

I say more, which is, that when we dispute of the markes of the true Church, we speake not of the vniuersall visible Church, the markes whereof are without question. For the marke which discerneth the vniuersall visible Church from the Iewes, Turkes, & Pagans, is the profession of Christianitie, & the Sacrament of Baptisme. The disputation then is touching the particular Churches: for there being diuers particular Churches disagreeing among themselues, we seeke those markes wherby the true Church, that is, the pure, and orthodox all Church (wherein a man may be saued) is discerned from the impure, wherein there is no saluation. For by this word *true Church*, we must necessarily vnderstãd the pure and the sound Church. For otherwise an hereticall Church may be called a true Church, euen as a man that hath a canker, or a plague sore, is yet a true man.

Whether the Church be visible, and to whom it is visible.

Then to come to *M. Arnoux*, which accuseth vs that we put the Church out of sight, he saith it without proofe, and our Confession saith nothing thereof. But on the contrary we know that there hath alwaies been, and shall be a Church visible in the world. But we must know how, and to whom it is visible. For it is one thing to see the Church as an assemblie of men calling themselues Christians, & another thing to see it to be a true and a pure Church, wherein a man may be saued. Those that are out of the Church, as Turkes and Iewes, see the Christian Church as we see a company of men, but see not whether it be good, and whether in it a man may be saued, which is the sight and the knowledge which we seeke for, that we may ioyne our selues thereunto. Infidels see the Church as the incredulous Iewes saw our Sauiour, without knowing that he was the Sauiour: and as a yong child sees a Mathematician, without knowing what a Mathematician is. As *Bellarmine* in his 15. Chapter of the third booke of the Church confesseth. Where neuertheless he slandereth vs, & imputeth to vs, that we doe not acknowledge any visible Church. 93. Sect.

Videmus catum hominum quæ est Ecclesia, sed quod ille cœtus sit ipsa vera Christi ecclesia non videmus.

Thereby it appeareth, that no man seeth or knoweth the true Church but those that are members thereof, or that after sufficiēt instructions haue determined to enter into the same. If the vniuersall Church were reduced but to twelue mē onely, yet it should be visible to those twelue. On the contrarie, if the Christian Church should containe & possesse the halfe of the world, the other halfe continuing in infidelitie, should not see that to be the true Church, and would not know it to be an assembly of the faithfull.

As touching this superficiall sight whereby those that are out of the Church see it, and know not whether it be a true or a pure Church, if one should aske whether the Church ought in that sort to be visible to all men in the world, & at all times, the question is easie to be answered. [For it is certaine that,

that the Christian Church began first in Iudæa, at which time it was not visible in France, nor in Denmarke. Before the Portugals and Spaniards sayled into the Indies, the Romane Church was not visible to the west Indians. And there are alwayes more Pagans then Christians in the world, & an infinite number of people that haue not once heard speaking of the Christian Church.

And to rise higher; was the Church visible then when *Abrahã* was yet in *Vr* in Chaldea, liuing in his fathers house which was an idolater? as it is said in the 24. Chapter of *Iosua*. Was the Church visible vnto the Infidels, when the Israelites were in Ægypt, and there serued Idols? as it is said, Ezech. 20. 7. and 8. Was the Church visible to the Infidels in the time of King *Achas* and *Manasses*, when those Kings made the Temple to be shut vp, and when no continuall sacrifice was made, and when Idols were in euery towne, when *Vrias* the high Priest placed the Pagan altar in the temple? But where shall the Church be visible to those that are out of it, when all the earth shall follow the Beast? Apocalyps 13. 3. and when the time shall come, whereof our Lord Iesus Christ speaketh, Luke 18. 8. *But when the Sonne of man commeth, shall he finde faith on the earth?* Shall the Church be visible to Infidels in the time wherein our aduersaries say that Antichrist shall abolish the continuall sacrifice, that is, the Masse, if you will beleeue them?

1 Chron. 23. 6, 7.

To be short, it is an euident & visible thing, that the Church of God is not alwayes visible to all men: but alwayes visible to those that are members thereof.

Of the true Markes of the true Church.

94. Sect. * Touching the markes of the true Church, that is to say, touching the markes wherby we may discerne a true, orthodoxall, & a pure Church, from an hereticall & an impure Church, our Confession in that Article putteth no other marke but the word of God purely preached; vnder which word we also compre-

comprehend the pure adminiſtration of the Sacraments: becauſe the right & true vſe of them is preſcribed in the Word of God. Wherein we ſpeake according to Ieſus Chriſt, who in the 8. 31. and 10. 27. of Saint *Iohn*, giueth no other marke to diſcerne his ſheepe, and thoſe that truly are his diſciples, but onely to heare his voyce, and to perſeuer in his Word; *If ye continue in my word, ye are verily my diſciples, Iohn* 8. 31. *The ſheepe heare the voyce of the ſhepheard, and follow him; for they know his voyce, and will not follow a ſtranger.* And ſay that the Word of God did not ſo expreſſely ſpeake thereof, yet it is certaine, that we muſt be voyde of common ſenſe, if we cannot conceiue, that to diſcerne a pure Church from an impure, there is no other meanes then to ſee whether it agreeth with the rule of puritie, which is the Word of God. As to know whether a Line be ſtraight, we apply it to a ſtraight Rule.

But that diſpleaſeth *M. Arnoux*, becauſe (in his iudgement) this marke is obſcure, and as hard, or hardlier to be knowne then the Church; and that it is the ſame whereof we diſpute, that is, to whom belongeth pure Religion, and who poſſeſſeth the Word. For he preſuppoſeth, (and with reaſon) that the markes to know a thing by, ought to be plainer and eaſier to know, then the thing which we know by thoſe markes.

Then the queſtion is, which of theſe two things is eaſieſt to be knowne, either true faith and Religion, or the true Church.

Beſides the places of Scripture before alledged, which will haue vs to know the true ſheepe and diſciples of Ieſus Chriſt, that is, if they hearken to his voyce, and keepe his word: reaſon giueth vs a demonſtratiue proofe, grounded vpon this maxime, that definitions and expoſitions of things ought to be clearer and better knowne then thoſe things which are expounded or defined. Now the definition of the true Church is, that it is the aſſembly of true beleeuers. Then before we can know wch is the true Church, we muſt know who are true beleeuers, and by conſequence, which is true faith:

faith. Now if we will define the Church as *Bellar.* doth, which is, that the Church is the assembly of those which are ioyned together by confession of the Christian faith; we must necessarily know what is true Christian faith, before we know the true Church, seeing that true faith is a chiefe point whereby to define the Church. From thence also it followeth that we must know Iesus Christ, that is, his nature and office, before we can know the true Church; for that faith in Iesus Christ, is of the very definition of the church. But see here a Iesuiticall Doctor, that will haue vs to know the true Church, before we know the true doctrine: and by consequence, before we know Iesus Christ. Which is a strange conceit, to imagine that a man may know which is the true Church, without knowing Iesus Christ; and who are true beleeuers, without knowing true faith.

Adde hereunto, that it is necessarie to know and to be instructed in the Word of God, before we can discerne the true church, seeing that by the Word of God onely we know that there must be a church in the world, by the which, God who declareth vnto vs, that his will is that there should be a Church, declareth also what manner of church he would haue it to be, and giueth vs markes to know it by.

Our Aduersaries themselues vnwittingly say the same, as often as they alledge the Scripture for themselues, & ground the authoritie of their Church vpon the testimonies of the Word of God. For thereby they presuppose, that the knowledge of the contents of the Scripture is necessarie, before they can know whether they haue the true Church, seeing they ground their church vpon the Scripture.

Adde hereunto, that there being diuers contrarie Churches, and but one Word of God contained in the Scriptures, and acknowledged by all the churches in the world; an infidel that would become a Christian, but is in doubt to which Church he should yeeld himselfe, cannot determine thereupon, but by beginning with the knowledge of that which all Christians receiue and embrace, which is the holy Scripture.

And

And I cannot conceiue how in this doubt, which Church is the pureſt of all, it is poſſible to take any other marke or any other direction then the rule of puritie, which is the Word of God. And that if there were any one, who before he had any knowledge of true Religion, met with or found out the true Church, and ioyned himſelfe with the good flocke, I ſay that ſuch a man, as long as he is ſo, is not a true Chriſtiã. He is like a blinde man that layeth hold on the firſt man that reacheth his hand vnto him. Such a man hath no hereſies, becauſe he hath no knowledge, and by conſequence, no faith nor pietie. He deriueth his Religion from his birth, or from cuſtome, or from the concourſe of ciuil affaires. If he were borne in another countrie, or if the State ſhould alter and be changed, he would haue another religion: he followeth the true Church, without knowing whether it be the true Church, and is a Chriſtian, and knowes not Chriſt.

Reade all the hiſtorie of the New Teſtament, and you ſhall neuer finde, that any man did acknowledge the true Church, before he was inſtructed in the doctrine of the Goſpell. But on the contrary, we ſee that the Apoſtles preached Ieſus Chriſt, and the doctrine of Saluation, and that the people by beliefe in that doctrine ioyned themſelues to the Church, without making any other enquirie touching the markes of the Church.

If men haue maliciouſly made difficulties touching the knowledge of the true doctrine, that ought not to be imputed to the obſcuritie or incertainty of this Marke, but to the malice of men. For all difficulties laid aſide, that which reſteth cleare and manifeſt in the holy Scripture, hauing no need of interpretation, is ſufficient to ſaluation. And beſides that, they are difficulties which men may auoyde, and whereupon we muſt craue the aide and aſſiſtance of God, which he hath promiſed. But to know the true Church before we know the true doctrine, it is not onely difficult, but alſo impoſſible. For, how ſhall I know whether this Church is a true Church, and pure in faith, if I know not what the puritie of true faith is, nor what true doctrine is?

Then

This appeareth by the impoſſibilitie and abſurditie of the markes which our Aduerſaries propound, whereby to know the true Church.

Of falſe Markes to know the Church: and firſt, of the title of Catholike.

95. Sect. The firſt marke of the Church, they ſay, is that ſhe is Catholike. If by Catholike they vnderſtand a ſound opinion, right faith, and true beliefe, as the ancient Fathers often take that word, who for that cauſe ſpeake of Catholike churches in the plurall number, we willingly allow and receiue that for a marke: for it is the ſame that we ſay, that the purity of doctrine is the onely marke of the true Church.

But if by Catholike they vnderſtand Vniuerſall, then that marke is falſe, and contrary to common ſenſe. For ſeeing that the quarell is betweene particular Churches, is it not a contradiction againſt themſelues, to ſeeke among particular Churches, to haue that to be the beſt which is not particular, but vniuerſall? So in the diſputation betweene the Greeke and the Romane Churches, how ſhould I know that the Church of Rome is vniuerſall, ſeeing that there being a Greeke Church, it is a proofe that the Church of Rome is not vniuerſall? And the Greeke Church alſo calleth it ſelfe Catholike, and the Patriarch thereof for aboue 900. yeeres together was called Vniuerſall. This diſputation betweene particular Churches, to know to which of them the title of the Vniuerſall Church belongeth, hath no better grace, then if Aſia, Affrica, and Europe, which are parts of the vniuerſall world, ſhould diſpute among themſelues to know to which of them the title of Vniuerſalitie belongeth. Time was, that the Churches of Syria and Egypt, &c. agreed with the Church of Rome: then all thoſe Churches were called Catholikes, that is, Orthodoxall, and following the faith which ought to be vniuerſall. But neither the Syrian, nor the Egyp-

Egyptian Churches called themselues Romane: but all of them together called themselues, The Vniuersall Church.

Of Antiquity.

They also produce Antiquitie for a marke of the true Church. If they vnderstand that that Church is the true Church whose doctrine is most ancient of all, and that doctrine which is conformable to the Apostles times, we allow of that marke; and by it the Church of Rome will lose her suite, which hath made a thousand new additions, and euery age increaseth them, all tending to the aduancement of the Papall Empire. For it was requisite to haue great alteration in Religion, to bring to passe that the Bishop of one Towne should become the earthly Monarch of all Christendome, and to surpasse the greatest Kings of the world in riches. Is it to be found (I speake not of the vniuersall Church) that any particular Church in the first ages of the Church did exclude the people from the participation of the chalice? or that read the Scripture to the people in a language which they vnderstood not? or that hath forbidden Christians to reade the holy Scriptures without speciall licence? or that made pictures and representations of the Trinity? or that worshipped Images? or that called the Virgin *Mary* Queene of Heauen, and Lady of the World? or that beleeued that the Pope can depose Emperours and Kings? or that the Pope hath the superabundant satisfactions of Saints in the Treasurie of the Church, and that hee can draw Soules out of Purgatory? or hath adored the hoste with the Diuine worship called Latria? Where is the least mention made in all Antiquitie of the Romish Indulgences, of Pardons of 800000. yeeres, of holy Graines, and Rosaries? of the least mention of the Court of Rome, of Cardinals, of the order of begging Fryers, of praying to God without vnderstanding what a man saith? & that Bishops ought to take oathes of allegiance to the Pope 96. Sect.

vpon their admissions? Herein our aduersaries hold their tongues and say nothing, and by their silence accuse Antiquity to haue bene ignorant in religion.

Furthermore, a doctrine cannot bee called ancient, which hath not bene from the beginning. As Copper by age will neuer become Gold, so a lie will still be a lie, notwithstanding Antiquity: there is no prescription against God & his word. And as shameless women, the older they grow, the impudenter they are, so vntruth is more dangerous by processe of time, because it still taketh more roote. Wee dispute not by yeeres, but by reasons; and that which at this day is called ancient, was once new. Let them tell me how many yeers are required to authorize a doctrine.

I say more, that the oldnesse of a chaire, is a presumption that there is something to bee mended, seeing that from the time of the Apostles, corruption then began to creepe into the Church, and that Saint *Paul* saith, that in his time the mistery of iniquity began to be hatched, 2. Thes. 2.

Of Succession. The third Marke.

97. Sect. Aboue and before all others, they make account of a lineall Succession, continued from the Apostles times. This marke might haue serued once in the ages next ensuing after the Apostles, when al the chaires erected and set vp by the Apostles agreed together, and when the Succession was short, and the memory of the beleefe (holden by the Bishops after the Apostles times) fresh. But now this marke is vnprofitable, because of the length of so many ages, and the intricacie and contradiction of Histories, but specially because the Chaires which draw their Succession from the Apostles, are now in discord and separated from communion: Among the which, that of Rome which seeketh to draw her Succession from Saint *Peter*, is condemned by the rest of the Chaires, which also draw their Succession from Saint *Peter*, that is, by the Church of Antiochia, and of Alexandria; among which the

the Church of Rome is the neweſt and the moſt corrupt, and condemned by al the reſt. So that if we ſhould ſtand vpon the Succeſsion of Chaires; it will bee hard to range it to the Church of Rome.

If the Succeſsion of Chaires ſince the Apoſtles times bee a marke, whereby ignorant people ſhould know the true Church, how is it poſsible that plaine country people, artificers and women ſhould know this ſucceſsion, which is learned onely by reading of the Greeke and Latin Fathers, the length and obſcurity whereof wearieth the wiſeſt men, and which oftentimes contradict themſelues?

Adde hereunto, that the pretended ſucceſsion of the Pope, is partly broken off by hereſies which haue defiled that Chaire, and by ſchiſmes which haue oftentimes cut off the line of that pretended Succeſsion, and neuer was knit againe, as we haue proued in the booke of the Vocation of Paſtors.

Adde hereunto, that the doctrine of the Church of Rome, is contrary to Saint *Peters* doctrine. The ſucceſsion of the chaire without ſucceſsion of doctrine, is rather a ſubuerſion of the chaire then a ſucceſsion. Wee ſhall not bee iudged by chaires at the latter day, but by the rules of the word of God. Chaires ſpeake not, but men ſpeake, who not onely ſpeake lies in chaires, but alſo make vſe of chaires to tell lies, and ſeeke to authorize lying by the dignitie of chaires & by ſucceſsion. They make a chaine of ſand which cannot bind mens conſciences. They ſhew a liſt of Popes in print, without ſhewing whether the laſt of them are of the ſame Religion that the firſt were. It is a ſucceſsion in perſons, and a contrariety in Faith. *Thoſe haue not the ſucceſſion of Saint Peter, which haue not Saint Peters Faith.* So ſaith Saint *Ambroſe* in his firſt booke and ſixt chapter of Penitence.

Non habent hereditatem Petri, qui fidem Petri non habent.

Of perpetuall Continuance. The fourth pretended Marke.

They alſo bring perpetuall continuance for a marke. If this

marke bee good, diuers Churches planted by the Apoſtles were falſe Churches, ſeeing they haue ceaſed to be Churches. And there are diuers Churches which the Church of Rome calleth heretickes and ſchiſmatickes, which haue continued euer ſince the Apoſtles time, and yet to this day continue. But for that the finall continuance of a Church cannot be ſeene but at the end of the world, I would aduiſe that the determination of this queſtion ſhould be put off vntill the end of the world. For ſome Church may flouriſh now, which within ſhort time may haue an end.

Of Multitude and Greatneſſe. The fifth Marke.

99. *Sect.* Our aduerſaries place Multitude and greatneſſe of number among the markes to diſcerne the true Church. This marke makes vs euidently ſee and perceiue, that our aduerſaries ſeek the markes of a particular Church: for as touching the vniuerſall Church, they confeſſe that it is but ſmall in number in reſpect of the Pagans and Infidels. But there being many particular Churches which contend together, they will haue the greateſt to bee the beſt. Now there is no colour to make that a marke of the true Church, wherein the true Church is farmounted by Mahumetans and Pagans: and much leſſe apparence, that to know the true Church we muſt haue a rope to meaſure the length and breadth of it, or to number the perſons, in ſtead of propounding the rules therof. By this reaſon, of two ſmal heretical Churches, the leſſe ſhall alwayes be the worſt. And when the ten tribes which made three quarters of the land of Iſrael, reuolted in *Roboams* time & became idolaters, they were to be followed. By this account Ieſus Chriſt miſreckoned himſelf when he called his Church a litle flock, Luk. 12. 32. and when hee will haue vs to go in at the narrow gate and ſtraight way, wherein but few do enter, becauſe the wide gate and broad way whereat many go in leadeth to perdition, Math. 7. 13. And when the high Prieſts and the Doctors,

ctors, and the greateſt part of the people held with the Phariſes, the Iewes ſhould rather haue followed the Phariſes then Ieſus Chriſt. There was a time when the Greek Church was at diſcord with the Romane Church, at which time it was greater then the Romane, and had the power of the Empire to vphold it. And the holy Ghoſt foreſheweth, that a time ſhal come when all the earth ſhall follow the beaſt, Reu. 13. To be ſhort, theſe people for a marke of the true Church, take the multitude which the Scripture placeth on the falſe Churches ſide, as if one ſhould ſet painting and powders for markes of chaſtity, and to be without bookes, for a marke of knowledge.

In the ſecond booke of *Theodorets* Hiſtory, *Liberius* Biſhop of Rome, ſpeaking to the Emperour *Conſtantine*, that vpbraided vnto him that he was alone, ſaid, *Although I am alone, the cauſe of Faith is not the weaker.* And *Gregory Nazianzen*, in his Oration againſt the Arians ſaith, *What are they that vpbraid vs with our pouerty? which deſire the Church by multitude, and deſpiſe the little flocke? As they haue the people, ſo we haue the Faith; they haue Gold and Siluer, wee haue Faith and Doctrine.* This is our condition.

Of Miracles. The ſixt pretended Marke.

Of the ſame nature are Miracles, which they alſo make to bee a marke of the true Church, which Ieſus Chriſt in the later times makes to bee markes of the falſe Church, ſaying, that *There ſhall ariſe falſe Chriſts, and falſe Prophets, and ſhall ſhew great ſignes and wonders, to ſeduce (if it were poſſible) the very elect*, Math. 24. 23. And Saint *Paul* ſaith, *That the ſonne of perdition ſhall come with all power and effectuall working of Satan, and ſignes and lying wonders*, 2. Theſſ. 2, 9. Many ſhall ſay vnto Ieſus Chriſt at the latter day, *Haue we not by thy name prophecied? and by thy name caſt out Diuels? and by thy name done many great workes?* And then Chriſt ſhall ſay vnto them, *I neuer knew you, depart from mee, ye workers of iniquity*, Math. 7. 22, 23. So in 100. Sect.

Lib. de Præscript. cap. 44.

Tertullians time Heretikes boasted and bragged that they wrought most Miracles. As the Miracles done at the publication of the Law did still serue to authorize the Law after Miracles ceased in Israel; so Miracles done in the publication of the Gospell by Iesus Christ and by the Apostles, do yet serue to authorize the Gospell, although Miracles haue ceassed. When King *Iosias* openly shewed the booke of the Law which had bene suppressed, 2. Chron. 34. he had no need to do any Miracle, because hee shewed no new thing. *An euill and an adulterous generation seeketh a signe*, Matth. 12. 39. It belongeth to the Church of Rome to do Miracles, because she propoundeth new doctrine. But what Miracles doth shee, and when? They are Miracles oftentimes condemned of falshood, and punished by Iustice. Miracles onely wrought to driue out Diuels, wherein the fiction is very easy, and wherein Satan taketh pleasure, coming foorth of set purpose to authorize a lie. And yet that is neuer done before vs, for in the presence of a man which feareth God, and beleeueth in Iesus Christ, Satan loseth his credit.

Of Vnity. The seuenth pretended Marke.

101. *Sect.*

They also giue for a marke of the Church, that it is *One*. Which is a pleasant and most certaine marke. For there is nothing in the world which is not *one*, euery horse is *one*, and euery tree is *one*, and the Sunne is *one*. By this meanes they giue vs a thing to be a mark of the Church which agrees also to an egge or to a lettuce. If by this word *one*, they vnderstand *vnited* and liuing in concord with all the Churches in the world, the Church of Rome shall not be the true Church, for she is at controuersy with her neighbours. And there would be no true Church in the world, because it is impossible to agree with all Churches: & Christian religion should be false, because it is diuided into sects & heresies. Or if by this word *one* they vnderstand *vnited* in it selfe, and hauing no discord within it, this vnion belongeth not to the Church of Rome, wherein

wherein there is a great debate touching the principall point of Religion, that is, which is the head and soueraigne of the Church, the Pope or Councels. For there can be no greater nor more important a quarrell in any State, then to dispute and make question to whom the Soueraignty belongeth. Also vpon the question whether the Pope may depose Kings and cause them to bee slaine, whereof there are infinite books on both sides written. And to speake of particular men, you shall hardly find two men which in al things agree together: one is content to pray vnto God without calling vpon Saints, another beleeues not Purgatory, another mocks at Pardons, another imagineth a manner to participate in the Body of Christ otherwise then his Church beleeueth. But if a man will go to Masse, and allow of the Popes authority, all this is tolerated. In the meane time the Councell of Trent excommunicateth all those which disallow of any of the points of the Romish Churches doctrine; In such manner, that there are not many persons found in the Church of Rome, which are not excommunicated by the generall iudgement of their Church. He that would take the paines to reade the bull *De Cœna Domini*, which the Pope publickly pronounceth and thundreth out euery yeere on Thursday before Easter, shall find, that the French Kings and their Courts of Parliament, and the most part of French men, are therein excommunicated and made as blacke as a coale, by the strongest and most solemne excommunicatiō which is pronounced in the church of Rome. And if it were not for the great profits and riches which knit the parts of the body together, as twins with different heads but tyed together by the bellies, wee should soone see the great body of the Church of Rome scattered and dispersed.

On the contrary, there are many hereticall Churches, whose bodies are ouer-strongly vnited, and whereof the members liue peaceably together. As the Turks, enemies to Christians, who haue a very great Empire, neuer disputing among themselues of any points of their Religion.

It is nothing to the purpose to tell vs, that wee are at vari-

ance with the Lutherans and the Anabaptiſts, for the Church of Rome alſo is at variance with them : Nor to ſerue their turnes againſt vs with thoſe argumẽts which the Turks and Iewes vſe againſt the Church of Rome with the like reaſon, which obiect againſt her, that ſhe agreeth not with ſo many Chriſtian Churches. Diſcord with other Churches is no proofe of error, but contrariety to the Word of God. But where truth is, Satan ſeeketh to raiſe trouble. Adde hereunto that there are many Churches which men thinke to be at diſcord with vs, which neuertheleſſe agree with vs touching the grounds and the eſſentiall parts of piety, and the meanes to attaine to ſaluation.

Of Holineſſe. The eighth pretended Marke.

102. *Sect.* Laſtly, they put Holineſſe for a marke of the true Church. If they vnderſtand holineſſe of manners, the church of Rome doth not attribute this praiſe and commendation vnto her ſelfe, but willingly confeſſeth the enormitie of her vices. If they vnderſtand her holineſſe to be in doctrine, we willingly allow of this marke. For that holineſſe is no other thing but purity in doctrine.

Which alſo ought to be ſaid touching the title of Apoſtolicall, for that is the Apoſtolicall Church, which followeth the doctrine of the Apoſtles. Many Churches founded by the Apoſtles, ſtriuing to hold the chaire, haue loſt the doctrine.

Of the Circle in diſputation.

ARNOVX.

103. *Sect.* *Whereby they fall into the fault of the Circle blamed in Logicke. Which is the true Church? That which hath pure Religion. Which is pure Religion? That which is in the Church. I know as much*

now

new as I did before. Which is Peter? It is Blittry, Which is Blittry? It is Peter. Behold the Circle wherein they couertly keepe themselues, against those which with reason blame them to haue gone out of the Church by the gate of apparences of the pure Word of God.

MOVLIN.

Aristotle in the second book *Priorum Analyticorum*, chapter 5. speaketh of a circulary syllogisme, which is made when after a man hath made one syllogisme, hee makes another, wherein the conclusion of the first syllogisme becomes one of the propositions, which ioyned with the other proposition conuerted, the conclusion which followeth, is no other thing but the proposition of the first syllogisme, in place whereof the conclusion was set. Whereby it appeareth that *M. Arnoux* vnderstands not what a circle in Logicke is: for euery circle is compoſed of syllogismes, but this circle which *M. Arnoux* giueth vs, is not a syllogisme. Who is *Peter*? It is *Blittry*. Who is *Blittry*? It is *Peter*. Which are words of some shew, and a conception fit for the Court, where mens spirits are polished. This Doctor discerneth not what difference there is betweene a circular syllogisme and a conuertible proposition: and yet in giuing vs a conuertible proposition, hee conuerteth it very vnfitly. The conuertible proposition which he propoundeth, is, *The true Church is that which hath true Religion*: Let vs see how hee conuerts it: which is thus. *Pure Religion is that which is in the Church.* This is not to conuert, but to peruert. To conuert it truly, he should say, Pure religiō is that which hath the true Church, which should bee an absurd proposition: whereby it appeareth, that falsly for a conuertible proposition, he putteth one which cannot be conuerted without spoiling. Therefore hee hath in such sort wrapt and intangled himselfe in this circle, that he himselfe is taken therein, as one that hath failed in his coniuration. And his conception of *Peter Blittry*, and of *Blittry Peter*, hath no more conceit then his imaginary circle. Also let him know that the sensible properties of a subiect, and conuertible

with

with that ſubiect, do not ceaſſe to be markes whereby to know the ſubiect. As in theſe propoſitions, Euery horſe neigheth, euery fire burneth, euery Adamant ſtone draweth iron to it. Then let him not think it ſtrange, if the pure preaching of the Word be a marke of the true Church, & yet conuerteth with the church. Of two conuertible termes the one is ordinarily more knowne then the other, and a man may make vſe of the one to make the other knowne.

Of the Church, and of the Markes thereof.

ARNOVX.

104. Sect. *Places of Scripture noted in the margent of the Confeſſion, Epheſ. 2.20. Being built vpon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe being the chiefe corner ſtone. And 4. 11, 12. He therefore gaue ſome to be Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Euangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers, for the repairing of the Saints, for the worke of the Miniſtery, and for the edification of the body of Chriſt: and 2. Timothy 3. 15. That thou haſt knowne the holy Scripture of a childe, which are able to make thee wiſe to ſalvation, through the Faith which is in Chriſt Ieſus.*

By all theſe places wee ſee that the Apoſtle goeth on diſtinguiſhing all the body, and the buildings of the Church in her members and pieces, the better to inſtruct vs touching the diuerſities of graces, the ordaining of charges, and the intent which God had in the eſtabliſhing of ſo faire a Monarchy. But he ſaith nothing of giuing either puritie of the word, or puritie of Religion for markes of the Church, for that ſuch things ought rather to be knowne by the Church, which makes vs know them.

MOVLIN.

Of theſe three places, the firſt is very fit to proue that which our

our Confeſſion ſaith, which is, that the true Church is that which conformeth her ſelfe to the Word of God. For whoſoeuer groundeth himſelfe vpon the Prophets and the Apoſtles, of neceſſity will conforme himſelfe to their words, and will follow their inſtructions. And note, that there St. *Paul* ſpeakes of the body of the Church, which he likeneth to a building, ſaying, *In whom all the building coupled together, groweth vnto an holy temple of the Lord.* Then if the Church be grounded vpon the doctrine of the Apoſtles, the doctrine of the Apoſtles muſt go firſt; and that as the true Church is grounded vpon the doctrine of the Apoſtles, ſo the knowledge of the true Church ſhould be grounded vpon the knowledge of the Apoſtles doctrine.

The ſecond place alſo is very fit for the ſame purpoſe: for God hath not ordained Prophets, Apoſtles, and Euangeliſts, to any other end, but that we ſhould follow their words; and this ſubiection of the faithful conſenting to obey their word, is that which maketh the aſſembly of the Saints, and the building of the body of Chriſt, which is the Church.

The third place is very pertinent and effectuall to proue that the knowledge of the Scriptures makes the faithfull, and by conſequence the true Church wiſe to ſalution. Now the Church cannot bee made wiſe to ſalution by the Word of God contained in the holy Scriptures, without following that Word, and conforming it ſelfe thereunto.

And whereas *M. Arnoux*, in ſtead of acknowledging the pure Word of God to bee a marke which maketh the Church knowne, will haue that the Church maketh knowne vnto vs which is the pure doctrine; he ſheweth thereby, that hee conceiueth not what the ſtate of the queſtion is, nor the point of our difference. For the difficulty is, how among diuers churches contrary in beleefe, a man may know the beſt, and that which propoundeth true doctrine. Therein, none of thoſe Churches ought to be Iudges, becauſe they are parties: and therefore it is requiſite and neceſſarie, that among thoſe parties contending together, there ſhould bea common rule, which ſerueth to diſcerne the pure Church from the impure.

Now

Now there is nothing but the word of God which is the rule of puritie. I grant that the true and orthodoxall Church teacheth pure doctrine, but we are at variance which is the true orthodoxall Church, whereof wee will haue God by his Word to be Iudge. But the Church of Rome will be Iudge in this cause, and will bee both Iudge and party: and to the end that she may not be contradicted by the Word of God, hideth this Word from the people, and forbiddeth them to reade the holy Scripture: and also saith, that she is the infallible Iudge of the Scripture, and of the sence and the authoritie of the Scripture. It is true that the orthodoxall Church teacheth the Word of God, not as a Iudge, but as witnesse and a guardian of the truth. But the Word of God maketh the true Church to bee knowne with infallible authoritie of a Iudge, and ordaineth what the true Church ought to bee.

Which is so certain and true, that we should not know that God wil haue a Church to be in the world, if the holy Scripture taught it not. The which declaring that there must bee a Church, declareth also by what markes it shall bee knowne, which is, if shee hearkeneth to the voyce of the good Pastor, and followeth not a stranger: Iohn 10. 4, 5. and if she persuereth in the Word of God, Iohn 8. 31.

Seeing there is but one holy Scripture, it will easily make vs know the pure Church: But there being manie contrarie Churches, vnto which of them must wee referre our selues touching pure doctrine? And how will she perswade a man that her doctrine is conformable to the Word of God, which to obey, the Church of Rome dares not looke into the holy Scripture?

If the true Church doth beare witnesse that this is the holie Scripture, shee doth it because she is bound to say so: but God is not bound to speake to vs in his holy Word, which the Church must obey. Now how can I know whether she obeyeth this Word, if before I beleeue the Church, I do not know what the Word is, nor what it commandeth to bee done?

Hee

He that hath no other proofe to know the Word of God, but onely becauſe the Church telleth him ſo, hath but a verie ſlight and an eaſy impreſſion thereof, and a coniecture without knowledge, vntill ſuch time as he himſelfe hath taſted & comprehended the doctrine of ſaluation, and that God thereby hath imprinted faith and repentance in his heart.

But now let vs ſee by what markes *M. Arnoux* will haue the vniuerſall Church to be knowne.

Markes whereby M. Arnoux will haue the true Church to be knowne.

Arnovx.

Contrary places of the Scripture. They muſt yeeld themſelues to the Creed or Symboles by them receiued in their Confeſſion of the Faith, in the fifth Article, wherein are ſhewed the markes of the Church, as vnity, holineſſe, vniuerſality, and ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, &c. All drawne and taken out of the holy Scripture. One, *Epheſ.* 4.5. Holy, 1. *Cor.* 6.11. Catholicke, *Marke* 16.15. Apoſtolicke, *Pſal.* 10.18. Spouſe of Ieſus Chriſt, *Oſee* 2.19. The houſe of God, *Matthew* 16.18. Viſible, *Pſal.* 18.6. Pillar and ground of truth, 1. *Tim.* 3.15. All theſe together, *Cant.* 4.6, 8, 9. *He is blind and very blind which ſeeth not this.* 105. Sect.

Movlin.

It is a great errour to thinke, that all that which the Scripture or Symboles ſay of the Church, ſhould be a marke whereby to know the viſible Church. Saint *Paul*, Eph. 5.25. ſaith, *That Chriſt loued the Church.* And in the Canticles it is often called the welbeloued. And Heb. 12.23. the Church is called *The aſſembly and congregation of the firſt borne, which are written in Heauen.* Would *M. Arnoux* haue the loue which Ieſus Chriſt beareth to his Church, or to be written in Heauen, to be markes whereby to diſcerne the viſible Church? It is very true, that there is but one vniuerſall Church; but doth it there-

therfore follow that this word *one* is a proper marke to know the true Church from the false; seeing also that euery false Church is *one*? Adde hereunto that *M. Arnoux* seatcheth for the markes of the vniuersall visible Church, but this vniuersall Church likewise containeth the false. We haue also shewed that vnity, vniuersality, holinesse, and the succession of the Apostles, agree not with the Church of Rome. The Greeke and Syrian Churches boast that they haue these markes, in such manner that the discord still continueth vntill we come to the word of God, which endeth the contention, and makes the truth knowne. And this is the reason why the Church of Rome hindreth the reading of it, and diminisheth the authority thereof.

Let vs see what places *M. Arnoux* setteth down vnto vs. He saith, that the Church is called *one*, in Ephes. 4.5. This is the verse, *There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme.* Of the Church here is nothing spoken. Thus you see already one falshood.

One. *M. Arnoux* Falshood.

He saith that the Church is called *holy*, 1. Cor. 6.11. That also is falsly alledged. The place is thus, *And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are iustified, in the name of the Lord Iesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* Wherein there is nothing spoken of the vniuersal church. For in the vniuersall visible Church all are not sanctified, ordinarily there are more wicked then good in it. This is a second falshood.

Holy. Falshood.

He saith that the Church is called *Catholicke*, Marke 16.15. This also is falsly alledged. The place is thus: *And he said vnto them; Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospell to euery creature.* Of the Church nor of vniuersality there is nothing spoken. It may be that he thought these words *all the world* and *al creatures*, signifieth the Catholicke church. That is false, for by these words Pagans & Infidels are also vnderstood, to whom the Apostles preached, and whereof the greatest part beleeued not their preaching. This is the third falshood.

Catholicke. Falshood.

He addeth, that the Church is called *Apostolicall*, Psal. 10. 18. That likewise is false, the place is thus, *To iudge the fatherlesse and the oppressed, that the man of the earth may no more oppresse.*

Apostolicall. Falshood.

oppresse. The lantern of *Iudas* which is kept in S. *Denis* church, might with as good reason haue bin alledged to this purpose. And it is not to be imagined that there is any fault in the cypher, for in all the Psalmes there is nothing spoken of the Apostolicall Church. Then this is the fourth falshood.

He saith, that the Church is called the *Spouse of Iesus Christ*, Osee 2.19. To what purpose serues that, when here we speak of the markes of the visible Church? Is the coniunction and neerenesse of the church with Iesus Christ a marke of the visible church? Is that a marke which is discerned by the eye? Adde hereunto that this honourable title belongeth principally to the Church of the elect, to the which Iesus Christ hath ioyned himselfe, to make it a glorious Church without spot or wrinkle, Ephes. 5.27. *Spouse of Iesus Christ.*

He addeth further, that in Math. 16.18. the Church is called the *House of God*. Although no mention of the house of God is found in that place, yet let vs put the case that it were truly alledged. For to be the house of God, is that a marke of the visible Church? Do those that are out of the Church see God dwelling therein? Adde hereunto, that there is no false church which pretendeth not to be the house of God. *House of God.*

He goeth on and saith, that the church is called *visible*, Psal. 18. 5. This is most false. The true place according to the Hebrew is thus, *Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world: in them hath hee set a tabernacle for the Sunne.* Of the which Sunne hee after describeth the beautie, swiftnesse, and heate, but speaketh not of the visible Church. The vulgar translation saith, *In Sole posuit tabernaculum suum, Hee hath set his tabernacle in the Sunne.* Which corruption being receiued, yet therein nothing is spoken of the visible Church. *Sanctes Pagninus*, a Lucquois and a Iacobin Fryer, translateth this place as wee do, and *Arias Montanus* a Spanish Doctor doth the like. But *Sixtus Senensis* keeper of the Popes Library reiecteth that exposition, and saith, that *the true and proper sence of those words is, that God hath set a tabernacle for the Sunne in Heauen.* So heere you haue a fift falshood, and that ioyned with a sopperie. In the Hebrew it is the 19. Psalme & 4. verse. Falshood. *Visible.*

For:

For what apparence is there to place visibleneſſe among thoſe markes which diſcerne the true Church from the falſe, ſeeing that the falſe Church alſo is ſeene, and that to be viſible is alſo proper to a tree, or to an horſe? The markes whereby men diſcerne one thing from another, ought to bee proper vnto them. And what makes that againſt vs, which acknowledge the Church to be viſible?

He alſo ſaith, that the Church is called the *ground and pillar of truth*, 1. Tim. 3. 15. which is true, for it belongeth to the Church to defend and ſupport the truth againſt errors. But what is that to the purpoſe, when we ſpeake of the markes of the viſible Church? is the duty of the Church a marke of the Church? How abſurdly ſhould I ſpeake, if I ſhould ſay, that one of the markes to know a vertuous man, from a vicious man, is, that the vertuous man ought to be wiſe?

Laſtly, he ſaith that in the fourth Chapter of the Canticles verſe 6, 7, 8, 9. all theſe markes are found together. Let the Reader peruſe the places, and he ſhall not there find one trace or footſtep of any of theſe markes. Then this is the ſixt falſhood. Where is conſcience? Is not this an abuſing of the people? Doth the Doctor in this manner contend againſt the places noted in the margent of our Confeſſion, by heaping vp ſo many falſhoods in ſo few lines? But it is true, that lying cannot be defended but by lies, and by corrupting of the holy Scripture.

Falſhoods heapt one vpon another.

THE XXVIII. ARTICLE.

Of the Confeſſion of Faith.

Whereupon M. Arnoux diſputeth againe of the perpetuity of the Church, and of her markes, and of Saint Peters Supremacie.

Vnder this beleefe we affirme, that there where the word

Word of God is not receiued where they make no profeſſion to ſubiect themſelues thereunto; and where there is no vſe of the Sacraments, to ſpeake properly, we cannot affirme that there is any Church. Therefore we cõdemne the aſſemblies of the Papiſts, becauſe the pure truth of God is baniſhed from thence, wherein the Sacraments are corrupted, adulterated, falſified, or wholly annihilated: and wherein all ſuperſtitions and idolatries haue their full ſwinge. We hold therefore that all thoſe which deale in ſuch actions and communicate therein, ſeparate and cut themſelues off from the body of Ieſus Chriſt. Neuertheleſſe, becauſe that as yet there reſti ſome ſmall traces of a Church in the Papacie, and that the ſubſtance of Baptiſme ſtil remaineth there: as alſo that the efficacy of Baptiſme dependeth not vpon him which adminiſtreth the ſame: we confeſſe, that thoſe which are baptized therein, haue no need of a ſecond Baptiſme. Yet in the meane time, by reaſon of the corruptions that are therein, children cannot be preſented thereunto without pollution.

ARNOVX.

If all that bee true, the Soune of God is not yet come into the world, ſeeing that one of the principalleſt markes of his comming, is the deſtroying of Idols. Now if by their reckoning the Romiſh Church bee Idolatrous, Idolatry was neuer in ſuch credit, nor was ſo farre ſpred abroad as it is now, nor neuer had larger limits then it hath and hath had theſe fiue or ſixe ages: from whence they deriue the beginning of the corruptions of the Church. 106. Sect.

MOVLIN.

By the ſame reaſon I could proue, that there are no more vices nor errors in the World, becauſe Ieſus Chriſt is come into the World to take them away. *M. Arnoux* is but ill

 ſeene

ſeene in hiſtories; if hee beleeueth that Ieſus Chriſt by his comming hath wholly expelled and remoued Idols: ſeeing that ſince Ieſus Chriſts time vntill now, there hath alwayes bene an infinite number of Idolaters, as in China, India, &c. And the Senate of Rome were Pagans and Idolaters 400. yeeres after Ieſus Chriſt, as wee may ſee by *Symmachus* Epiſtles. Reade Reuelation 9. 20. and you ſhall ſee that the Spirit of God foreſheweth, that men did not repent of the ſeruice which they did to Idols. This Propheſie is not againſt vs, which neither adore Idols, Images, Relicks, nor Sacraments, but adore God only, Father, Sonne, and holy Ghoſt, & eleuate our hearts and adorations vp to Heauen, where Chriſt ſitteth at the right hand of God: neither do wee cut off the ſecond Commandement from the Law of God, wherein the ſeruice of Images is prohibited.

The aduerſary is likewiſe miſtaken, to preſume that the Church of Rome is not Idolatrous, becauſe it hath a precinct largely extended. Pagans and Infidels, which are manifeſt Idolaters, haue much greater territories. The Church is a litle flocke, Luke 12. 32. The gate is narrow which goeth in to life eternall, and few there be which find it, Mat. 7. 14. All the earth followeth the Beaſt, Reuel. 13. 4.

ARNOVX.

107. Sect. *They note no places at all. This period of wrongs offered to the ſpouſe of the Lambe, hath no proofe in the Scripture.*

MOVLIN.

Our Confeſſion ſaith, that the pure Word of God is baniſhed out of the Papiſts aſſemblies. To proue it, it is not poſſible to alledge any places out of the Scripture: for the Scripture ſpeaketh neither of Pope nor Papacy (vnleſſe by way of Propheſie.) It containeth not an hiſtory of corruptions happened ſince the Apoſtles time, but onely ſpeaketh of rules how to ſhun thoſe corruptions. Adde hereunto, that euery error of the Papacy whereby the pure Word of God is corrupted,

rupted, is confuted by the places noted vpon the margents of our Confeſſion; and it was not neceſſary nor poſſible to put all the places which are noted vpon the other Articles, in the margent of this 28. Article.

Touching the title *of the Spouſe of the Lambe*, which *M. Arnoux* giueth to the Church of Rome, it agreeth ill with that which *Bellarmine* ſaith, lib. 1. cap. 9. *de Pontifice Rom.* where he ſaith, That the Pope is the ſpouſe and head of the Church, *Chriſto ſeclu ſo*, Ieſus Chriſt being excluded or ſet aſide. This excellent title properly belongeth to the Church of the elect, and ſo is this word taken, Reuel. 21. 9. And if by analogie this title be communicated to the viſible Church, it belongs not to a particular Church to attribute the ſame vnto her ſelfe aboue all others, and much leſſe to the Church of Rome, whereof the head, Reuel 17. 15. is deſcribed by a woman cloathed in ſcarlet, which ſitteth in that Citie which hath ſeuen Hils, which maketh the Kings of the earth drunke: whereof it is foreſhewed that he ſhall call himſelfe God, and that he ſhall worke ſignes and wonders, 2. Theſſ. 2. And his doctrine is noted, to wit, the forbidding of meates and marriage, 1. Tim. 4. 3. Reade ouer all the hiſtories, and runne ouer all the earth, and ſee if you can find any other then the Pope of Rome, to whom theſe markes belong.

§ *Ac ne fortè. Profectò ſi Eccleſia quæ eſt in terris, Chriſto ſeclu ſo, non inter epiſt comparatur ſponſa, ſeclu ſo etiam Chriſto vnum caput habere debet.*

ARNOVX.

On the contrary, the Prophets in all places promiſe the Church which was pure from errors in the beginning, perſeuerance in her integrity. 108. Sect.

MOVLIN.

That is not ſo. The Prophets ſay no ſuch thing: you ſhou'd alledge thoſe places: for the Prophets knew well that the Church of Iſrael which was pure in the beginning, became idolatrous in Egypt, Ezech. 20. 7, 8. They knew well that the Children of Iſrael had worſhipped the golden Calfe, *Aaron* himſelfe the high Prieſt participating with them in the ſame ſinne. They knew well that in the time of the Iudges, the

people of Israel many times left the service of God to follow Idolatry. They knew that in the times of *Achaz* and *Manasses*, Idolatry was erected in euery towne, and that *Urias* the high Priest erected an Idolatrous Altar in the Temple, 2. Kings 16. The Churches of Ierusalem and of Antiochia were pure in their beginning, and established, the one by Iesus Christ, the other by Saint *Peter*; and yet the Church of Rome holdeth that they are corrupted. Why may not the like happen to the Church of Rome, which is but a particular Church, which swalloweth vp the rest, and hath no particular promise that it shall neuer erre, but rather threatnings to be cut off, if she perseuer not in the bountifulnesse of God? Rom. 11. 22.

ARNOVX.

109. *Sect.* *It is therefore with the eyes of affection that the Ministers looke vpon the Catholicke Church, and not with the eyes of ancient faith, which makes vs know the same by infallible signes, as by antiquity contrary to nouelty: by succession contrary to interruption: by vniuersality contrary to finalnesse of number: by vniformity contrary to diuision: and by eminence of doctrine contrary to licentiousnesse and impiety.*

MOVLIN.

All this hath bene examined before in the 95. Sect. and the rest of the Sections following, where we haue shewed, that not one of these markes belong to the Church of Rome.

Of Licentiousnesse and prophane life.

110. *Sect.* Touching Licentiousnesse and impiety, wherewith *Mr. Arnoux* vpbraideth those Churches that are separated from the Church of Rome, therein he speaketh against his owne Conscience. For hee knowes well, that in this point the Church of Rome beares away the bell for prophaneneſſe of life and impiety, from all the Churches in the world. I speake not

not of particular perſons, among whom I doubt not but that there are many that liue with ciuil honeſty, and which thinke that in their Religion they do ſeruice to God. I ſpeake onely of publike orders. For in all other Churches, vices are accounted euils and corruptions, but in the Church of Rome, vices are accounted vertues, and are become lawes. None but the Church of Rome teacheth periurie, which by a decree of a * Councell, declareth that men are not bound to keepe Faith and promiſe with heretickes: and which teacheth that the Pope can diſpenſe with oathes made to God.

* This is to be ſeen in the 19 Seſſion of the Councell of Conſtance.

None but the Church of Rome by publicke order, hath eſtabliſhed the Stewes, and by Law permitted fornication.

None but the Church of Rome, giueth remiſſion of ſinnes, vpon condition to do euill, and which maketh the grace of God to be a reward of diſloyalty and wickedneſſe. So whileſt the laſt warres of the League in France continued, the Pope gaue nine yeeres of pardon to all thoſe French-men that ſhould reuolt from the obedience of the King. Thoſe pardons were ſet vp vpon Church-doores, and on the corners of the ſtreets.

None but the Church of Rome maketh God an example of iniuſtice and of deceitfull reuenge, in this, that they teach that God pardoneth mens faults, but not the puniſhment for them, quitting our debt, but not the payment of the debt. For ſo he that ſhall haue receiued any iniury, and hath pardoned the partie that did it, may after pardon giuen, bee reuenged on him, and ſay, that hee did pardon his offence, but not the puniſhment of the offence. For, why will they haue a man to bee more iuſt and mercifull then God? Wee are too much inclined to do euill, without being incited thereunto by the example of God.

None but the Church of Rome giueth way to cruelty, teaching that he is not a murtherer which with zeale to the holy mother Church of Rome, killeth one that is excommunicated, which is Pope *Vrbans* doctrine, in the Canon *Excommunicatorum, Cauſa* 23. *Queſt.* 5.

None but the Church of Rome diſpenſeth with ſubiects

oathes of Allegiance to their Kings, and which inciteth them to rebellion, when it hath pleased the Pope to pronounce sentence of Deposition against a King. Whereof there is a Canon and a Rule in the Councell of Latran vnder *Innocent* the third, Canon 3. And the Councell of Constance practised the same against *Fredericke* Duke of Austria in the twentieth Session.

None but the Church of Rome dispenseth with children to bee disobedient, and to leaue the subiection to their Fathers and Mothers commanded by the Law of God, when against their fathers and mothers wils they saue themselues, and enter into a Monasterie as into a Sanctuarie of rebellion. Reade Numbers 30. 4. 5. 6. where the vowes of a daughter, made contrary to her fathers will, are declared voyde and of no force.

*Toletus lib. 5. de Instruct sacerd. cap. 1. In duobus casibus filius debet accusare patrem; in crimine laesae maiestatis & in crimine haeresis.

None but the Church of Rome permitteth Doctors, by word of mouth and by writing, to maintaine that it is lawfull to vse equiuocation in Iustice, and that confessions of enterprises against the liues of Kings and Princes ought not to be reuealed,* and that it is lawfull for a sonne to accuse his father, and to procure his death, if he be an hereticke.

Suares in his booke against the King of great Britaine. li 6. c 4.

None but the Church of Rome selleth sacred things, and prayers for the dead, and maketh open traffick of Benefices and Ecclesiasticall functions.

faith, that the lawful successor of a King which is deposed by the Pope, ought to kill that King.

None but the Church of Rome suffereth a man which calleth himselfe, Head of the Church, to weare the Crosse of Christ vpon his shoo, and to lay the holy Scripture at his feete when he commeth into Councels. The practice whereof was seene in the first* Session of the last Councell of Latran.

*Officiales ad pedes sanctissimi Domini nostri in sacris sacrosanctis scripturis praestiterunt corporale iuramentum.

None but the Church of Rome permitteth fables to bee read, and forbiddeth the reading of the holy Scriptures.

If I would display and set forth what is done in Rome, from whence these rules come, and shew how vices against Nature are there become naturall; how men there burne those which beleeue that there is no other Head of the vniuersall Church but Iesus Christ, no other Purgatory then his

his blood, nor other propitiatory Sacrifice then his death; and where neuertheleſſe they let the Iewes liue in peace, which affirme Ieſus Chriſt to bee a deceiuer, and which for money buy liberty to blaſpheme; it were an eaſy matter to make long and true diſcourſes vpon this ſubiect, and yet to ſay nothing but from the Popes themſelues, and from the writers in the Romane Church, which make the like complaints.

And I ſay that the vices of other Churches are more tolerable then the vertues of the Romiſh Church, ſeeing that vertues there are degenerated into outward ſhewes, and pietyinto a ſcrupulous deuotion: as alſo that there they preſume to do greater numbers of works, and ſuch as are perfecter then God hath commanded, in ſuch ſort that God is debter to men, and is bound to make them reſtitution. For God eaſlier beareth with ſinnes for which men repent, then with righteouſneſſe proudly preſumed on.

Seeing alſo, that in ſtead of framing men to a voluntarie obedience, and to filliall loue, by the knowledge of the loue which God beareth vnto vs, ſhe inciteth men to good works by the feare of a fire prepared for the children of God in Purgatory, planting in their ſpirits a trembling piety, and a ſeruile feare, in ſtead of a filiall loue; and to be ſhort, a repentance whereof they muſt repent.

Of Saint Peters Supremacie.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. I ſay vnto thee, that thou art Peter, III. *Sect.*
and vpon this ſtone I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not preuaile againſt it.

By this place, firſt the Sonne of God aſſigneth ſome recompence to the notable and excellent confeſſion of the Apoſtle, who firſt afore all others acknowledged the naturall Sonne of God.

MOVLIN.

Others before S. *Peter* made that Confession, as *Nathanael*, Ioh. 1.49. *Thou art that Sonne of God, thou art that King of Israel.* And all the Apostles knew that Iesus Christ was the Sonne of God, hauing heard the voice of God speaking from Heauen, saying, *This is my welbeloued Sonne, heare him.* It was not by his owne naturall sense, but by Diuine reuelation, that *Peter* acknowledged Iesus to be the Sonne of God; as Iesus Christ himselfe saith vnto him in the same place, *Flesh and blood hath not reuealed it vnto thee, but my Father which is in Heauen.*

This promise therefore which the Lord made vnto him in this place, is an augmentation of graces, and not a recompence for merits.

MRNOVX.

112. *Sect.* *Secondly, this recompence is giuen to none other, but to him to whom onely he addressed himselfe with all the circumstances which in any sort may make a discourse individuall.*

MOVLIN.

I answer with S. *Augustine*, in the 118. Tractate vpon St. *Iohn*, That S. *Peter* spake that for all the Apostles, and receiued that for them all, as representing vnity in his person: and with S. *Ambrose*, vpon the 38. Psalme: *Quod Petro dicitur, Apostolis dicitur*: That which was said to S. *Peter*, was said to the Apostles. And our Aduersaries confesse that the keies of the kingdome of Heauen were giuen to all the Apostles. Whereby it followeth, that Iesus Christ in this place promising to giue the keies to S. *Peter*, promised them also to the rest of the Apostles. For he spake not vnto them of the keyes, but in that place onely.

ARNOVX.

113. *Sect.* *Thirdly, the recompence which he assigned vnto him, is a dignitie of preeminence, seeing he saith, that he is the corner stone of the foundation whereon all the house dependeth.*

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

In this place Ieſus Chriſt giueth not any power to *Peter*, but only maketh a promiſe thereof. And that which he here promiſed, he giueth and conferreth it actually vpon him, Ioh. 20. 22, 23. where Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh thus to all the Apoſtles, ſaying, *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you. Whoſe ſinnes ſoeuer ye remit, they are remitted vnto them, and whoſe ſinnes ſoeuer you retaine, they are retained.* So in the actuall confurring of the power which he had promiſed, he made the Apoſtles equall. As alſo Mat. 18. 18. he ſpeaketh thus to all his Apoſtles, *Verily I ſay vnto you: whatſoeuer you binde on earth, ſhall be bound in heauen, and whatſoeuer ye looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heauen.*

And it is to bee noted, that after that promiſe made to St. *Peter*, the Apoſtles ſtroue among themſelues for the ſuperiority, which they would not haue done, if they had vnderſtood, that by thoſe words, the Lord had promiſed the ſuperiority to *Peter*, and would not haue withſtood the commandement of the Lord. But *M. Arnoux* hath a conceit, that hee vnderſtandeth Ieſus Chriſts words better then the Apoſtles did. Alſo it is falſe, that Ieſus Chriſt did declare S. *Peter* to be the corner ſtone of the Church. He ſaith not, *Super te Petrum*, but, *Super hanc Petram*: he ſaith not, *Vpon thee Peter*, but, *vpon this ſtone*, which is cleere in the Greeke, where it is ſaid: ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, and not ἐπὶ σὲ τῷ πέτρῳ. For πέτρος in Greeke alſo ſignifieth *a ſtone*: and ſo the alluſion had had a good grace. But the holy Ghoſt guiding S. *Matthewes* pen, thought it better to loſe the grace of that alluſion, then to let vs ſtumble at that ambiguity.

And certainly, the Church of God is not grounded vpon a mortall man; it was a Church before St. *Peter* was, and at St. *Peters* comming it altered not the foundation. And Saint *Peter* being dead, the Church muſt of force haue changed her foundation, and thereby haue bene much impaired. Wee are grounded vpon the ſame foundation whereon St. *Peter* was grounded, but he was not grounded vpon himſelfe. And if it be ſo, that the Church ſpoken of in this place, ſhould bee the Church of the elect, if Saint *Peter* was the foundation of the

the elect, hee was also the foundation of the election. Now it appeareth that here the Scripture speaketh of the Church of the elect, because Iesus Christ saith, that the gates of hell, that is, the power of the Diuell, should not preuaile against it, and by consequence that neither the Diuell, nor Hell can cast any one of those which are of the Church, into Hell. Which cannot agree with the vniuersall visible Church, whereof Satan
Apocal. 13.7. seduceth many: against the which the Beast shal make warre, and ouercome it. Our aduersaries themselues say, that Antichrist shall abolish the Masse, and therefore he shall preuaile against the Church of Rome.

Not that I deny, that S. *Peter* may be called the foundation of the visible Church, so that by S. *Peter* we vnderstand his doctrine, in which sence the Fathers vnderstand it. But also in this sence all the Apostles equally are foundations of the Church: as it is said, Ephes. 2. 20. *And are built vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Iesus Christ himselfe being the chiefe corner stone.* Note these words *himselfe*, expressly set downe to discerne Iesus Christ from the Apostles, which are not foundations *themselues*, but in their doctrine.

Then this fundamentall stone is Iesus Christ, confessed by S. *Peter*: for Iesus Christ is commonly called the stone. As 1. Cor. 10. 4 *The rocke was Christ.* And Psal. 118. 22. Esay 28. 16. Rom 9. 33. and in many other places. So Saint *Augustine* vnderstands it in his 10. Treatise vpon the first of S. *Iohn*, saying, *What meaneth this, Vpon this stone I will build my Church? Vpon this Faith, vpon that which hath bene said, Thou art the Christ, the Sonne of the liuing God.* Reade also his 50. and 24. Treatise vpon Saint *Iohn*. And his 13. Sermon vpon the words of our Lord, where he effectually insisteth thereupon. And S. *Hilary* in his sixt booke of the Trinity: *Vpon this stone of the Confession the Church is built.* *Chrysostome* in his 55. Homily vpon the 16. of S. Matth. saith: *Vpon this stone, that is, vpon the Faith of the Confession.* And in his Sermon of Pentecost, *Hee said: Vpon this stone, and not vpon Peter. For hee built not the Church vpon men, but vpon the Faith.* See S. *Ambrose* also vpon the second to the Ephesians.

Super hanc confessionis petram Ecclesia ædificatio est.

ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τουτέστι τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας.

Of

Of Saint Peters Succeſſors.

ARNOVX.

This dignity which cannot die with Saint Peter, is neceſſarily transferred to his ſucceſſors, for that God never changed the forme of the gouernment, once eſtabliſhed by diuine right. 114. Sect.

MOVLIN.

If S. *Peter* had not the dignity to be the chiefe corner ſtone of the Church, as we haue already ſhewed, he had no ſucceſſors in a dignity which he had not.

But put the caſe that St. *Peter* had bene the head and the foundation of the vniuerſall Church, doth it from thence follow, that he had a ſucceſſor in that dignity? *Moſes* was by God eſtabliſhed to bee the Prince, Law-giuer, and Prieſt in Iſrael, but left no ſucceſſor, becauſe God had not ſo ordained it. S. *Iohn Baptiſt* had no ſucceſſor. The reſt of the Apoſtles had no ſucceſſors in their Apoſtleſhip; why then ſhould St. *Peter* haue a ſucceſſor in his, ſeeing that God in his Law did not ordaine it to be ſo? and that S. *Peter* in his 2. Epiſtle which he wrote vnto the vniuerſall Church doth not will Chriſtiãs to acknowledge the Biſhop of Rome for his ſucceſſor? Was there euery any kingdome or ſouereignty temporall or ſpirituall eſtabliſhed in the World, without lawes made touching the ſucceſſion thereof, and touching the forme of chuſing or ſucceeding? Here we haue no ſuch thing, nor no declaration of the Will of God vpon this matter.

Adde hereunto, that if Saint *Peter* was eſtabliſhed head of the vniuerſall Church, it was then when it was little, & compounded of a ſmall number of men, which order could not be obſerued when the Church began to ſpread it ſelfe abroad throughout all the World. There are no one mans ſhoulders ſtrong enough for ſo great a burthen. It would make a

mans

mans head giddie to bee lifted vp ſo high.

And if after Saint *Peters* death, there had beene neceſſitie to haue a ſucceſſor in the office of the Head of the Vniuerſall Church, I make all men Iudges, that haue any ſparke of free iudgement, whether that office ought not of right to appertaine to Saint *Iohn* or Saint *Iames*, whom Saint *Paul*, Galat. 2. calleth *pillars*; and which outliued Saint *Peter* a long time, rather then to deferre it to *Linus* Saint *Pauls* diſciple, of whom we know nothing but the name? or to *Clement*, who ſaith in his * Epiſtles, That mens goods and women ought to bee common, and * that fourth marriages are manifeſt fornication?

* *Can. Dilectiſſimis Cauſa. 12. Queſt. 1. Lib. 3. Conſtit. Apoſt. cap. 2. Id quod ſupra trigamiã ſit manifeſta fornicatio indicatur.*

At the leaſt, it had bene reaſon, and very requiſite, to haue done thoſe excellent Apoſtles that honour to haue cald them, and to haue askt their aduice touching the choiſe of a head of the Vniuerſall Church. Who will beleeue that the people of the Citie of Rome had the credit, of their owne authoritie to giue a head to the Church of all the World, and that during the liues of the Apoſtles, and without making them acquainted therewith?

Eſpecially after the death of all the Apoſtles, when by the witneſſe of all Antiquity, Biſhops, and ſpecially the Biſhops of Rome, were choſen by the voyces of the people of the City: could the people of Rome giue a head to the Churches of Aſia, Egypt, Perſia, and the Indies, without acquainting them with it? No man will beleeue it, but hee that hath a mind to be deceiued.

If S. *Peter* was at Rome, and there erected the Church and the Biſhopricke, as they ſay, the Biſhop of Rome may be cald S. *Peters* ſucceſſor, but not in the quality of an Apoſtle or head of the vniuerſall Church, but in qualitie of the Biſhop of the City of Rome, which is the higheſt quality which the ancient Biſhops of Rome tooke on them in their Epiſtles. And yet this ſucceſſion ceaſeth, when the doctrine begins to be corrupt.

Pag. 110. *M. Arnoux* about the end of his booke, to ſupport the Popes ſupremacy, alledgeth a place out of the third booke of

Irenæus,

Irenæus, chapter 3. but falſified and corrupted according to his manner. He maketh *Irenæus* ſay, *that it is abſolutely neceſſary, that all the Church ſhould agree and adhere to the Church of Rome, wherein the preeminence of principality reſideth.* This place is falſly alledged, *M. Arnoux* hath added the word *adhere*, which is not in *Irenæus*. Alſo he tranſlateth the word *convenire*, to agree, whereas it ſignifieth to ariue, or come from diuers parts to one place. To this falſhood of words he addeth a corruption of the ſence. For *Irenæus* by this principall preeminence vnderſtandeth the power of the City of Rome, becauſe it was the Imperiall ſeate, and not the ſupremacy of the Biſhop or of his Church. Hee would ſay, that becauſe of the Imperiall ſeate, and of the Senate, Chriſtians from all places of neceſſity came thither. This is the place as it is in *Irenæus*, *It is neceſſary that all Churches ſhould come hither to this Church, becauſe of the ſoueraigne power*, that is, the power of the Empire. Which is the reaſon why the 9. Canon of the Councell of Antiochia ordained that the Biſhops of great Cities ſhould haue preeminence. * *Becauſe (ſaith the Councell) that all thoſe that haue any buſineſſe, come to the Metropolitane City, therefore it hath bene ordained, that the Biſhop thereof ſhould haue a preeminence of honor.* For that cauſe therefore the Church of Alexandria went before that of Antiochia, although the Church of Antiochia was the ancienter, and founded by Saint *Peter*, becauſe that among the Cities of the Romane Empire, Alexandria according to ciuill order was the ſecond next to Rome. The 17. Canon of the Councell of Chalcedon ſpeaketh expreſly thereof, where it is ordained, that *the order of Eccleſiaſticall Dioceſſes ſhould bee accommodated according to ciuill and publike formes.* Following that order, the 630. Biſhops aſſembled at that Councell, ordained *that the Biſhopricke of Conſtantinople ſhould haue the ſame prerogatiues that the ancient Imperiall Biſhopricke of Rome had, and that it ſhould be as much honored as Rome in Eccleſiaſticall affaires, as being the ſecond City in rancke after Rome.*

Ad hanc Eccleſiam propter potentiorem principalitatem, neceſſe eſt omnem conuenire Eccleſiam.

Διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς τὰ πράγματα ἔχοντας, ὅθεν καὶ τῇ τιμῇ προηγεῖσθαι αὐτήν.

τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς τὰς διοικήσεις.

Of

Of the perpetuity of the Church.

ARNOVX.

115. Sect. *Such an house of God founded vpon this stone, hath for an infallible marke, that it shall neuer be shaken, and that the gates of Hell, that is to say, heresies and persecutions shall haue no power against it. Then if there be any other Church which enioyeth this priuiledge of a perpetuall interruption and a succession neuer broken, let them shew it vs. If there be not, let them pull this place out of their Bibles, or deface their Article, which striuing against the Church of Rome, disannulleth the promise of the Sonne of God.*

MOVLIN.

If by Succession our Aduersary vnderstandeth a succession of persons without succession of doctrine, this succession is nothing, but rather a corruption then a Succession. Such (by the iudgement of the Church of Rome) is the Succession of the Greeke Church, which hath continued from the Apostles time, and yet continueth, and is ancienter then the Church of Rome. But if by perpetuall Succession he vnderstandeth a line of succession of men perseuering in the same doctrine, this Succession doth not in any manner belong to the Church of Rome. The latter Bishops of Rome, are nothing like the first, & it seemeth that the last are expresly risen vp to condemne the first. In the first age of the Church, were the Bishops of Rome temporall Princes? Did they weare a Regall Crowne? Did they take vpon them to depose Emperors and Kings? Did they draw Soules out of Purgatory? Did they giue pardons for seuen or eight hundred thousand yeeres? Did they allow adoration of Images? Did they prohibit to giue the cup to the people, and to reade the Scriptures? Did they say Seruice in an vnknowne tongue? Did they worship the host with diuine worship cald Latria? Did they call vpon Saints?

Did

Did they paint the Trinity? Did they call the Virgin *Mary*, Queene of Heauen? These are ſmarting ſores, which none of the aduerſaries dare once touch, nor vndertake to produce a place of antiquity for any of theſe points. Therfore our aduerſaries haue but little cauſe to boaſt of perpetuity, after they haue made a new religion, and by conſequence a new church.

Neuertheleſſe, ſay that the Church of Rome had continued euer ſince the Apoſtles time, doth it follow that perpetuall cõtinuance of the Romiſh Church, is a marke of her purity? Is the later day yet come? Will *M. Arnoux* warrant it from this time vntill then from ſubuerſion? A thing cannot be called perpetuall which hath not continued vnto the end. This Doctor giues vs his future hopes, for preſent marks of the church. Beſides there are diuers falſe churches which haue continued from Chriſts time, and ſtill continue to this day.

Of the Idolatry of the Romiſh Church, and in how many ſorts the Church of Rome is Idolatrous, and what Idolatry is.

The 28. Article of our Confeſſion ſaith, that in the Church of Rome *all ſuperſtitions* and *Idolatries are permitted.* This accuſation is of no ſmall moment, ſeeing that 1. Cor. 6. 9. the Apoſtle ſaith, that *Idolaters ſhall not inherit the kingdome of Heauen.* Therefore we cannot intreate of a matter of more importance, becauſe it concernes ſaluation, and excluſion out of the kingdome of Heauen. If the word *Idolatry* doth offend our aduerſaries, wee would haue them to conſider, that wee cannot call things otherwiſe then the Word of God calleth them; and alſo to beleeue, that our intent is not thereby to offend them, but to make them know and feele their owne euill: which cannot be done by flattering them, or by diſguiſing the truth: and that if they be offended at this which we ſay of them, God is much more offended at that which they do vnto him. And if for propounding the Word of God vnto them, they hate vs, we neuertheleſſe will not ceaſſe to take com- 116. *Sect.*

compaſſion on them, & lend them our helping hands, at leaſt to diſcharge our owne conſciences.

I ſay, that in fixe things the Church of Rome committeth Idolatry. Firſt, by adoring the hoſt which the Prieſt holdeth in his hands, and calling that God which is not ſo. Secondly, by attributing that honor to Saints, which only appertaineth to God; by calling vpon them, by making them mediators, by asking ſaluation of God by their merits, and by beleeuing that they know the hearts and thoughts of men. Thirdly, by calling the Virgin *Mary* the Inuentrix of grace, Queene of Heauen, and Lady of the World: for the Royalty & Empire ouer all creatures belongeth to God only. Fourthly, by the adoration and worſhipping of Images. Fiftly, by adoring the croſſe. And ſixtly, by worſhipping the bones, apparell, and other relickes of the dead. The firſt ſort of Idolatry ſhall bee ſpoken of in the end of this worke. The ſecond and third ſort hath bene declared and diſcourſed on at large in the 24. Article of our Confeſſion. There remaine the three laſt, that is, adoration of images, of the croſſe, and of relicks. Vpon all which in generall we ſay, that we call thoſe Idolaters which yeeld a worſhip and religious ſeruice to creatures, or that partly or wholly tranſport to creatures that honor which is due to God. By which definition it appeareth, that the moſt holy and moſt excellent creatures may bee transformed into Idols by thoſe that are ſuperſtitious: ſo farre, as that ancient Chriſtians called the Arians Idolaters, becauſe denying Ieſus Chriſt to be the eternall and ſouereigne God, neuertheleſſe they called on him, and yeelded religious ſeruice vnto him. From whence it followeth, that thoſe which honour Saints with ſuch honors whereby God is diſhoneured, do wrong the Saints by honoring them, ſeeing that as much as in them lyeth, they transforme them into Idols.

Of the words Image and Idoll. And of the Hebrew words Peſel and Temunah, which God vſeth in the Law.

Before

Before wee proceed further, you muſt vnderſtand the words: Image is a Latine word, and Idoll is a Greeke word: both the one and the other in their firſt originall, and as they are taken and vnderſtood by good and ancient Authors, ſignifie reſemblance and repreſentation. *Tertullian* a great Doctor touching ſignification of words, calleth all figures and repreſentations, *Idols*, in the third Chapter of his Booke of Idolatrie. *Idos* [a] *in the Greeke ſignifieth a forme or repreſentation, from whence the diminutiue Idolon is deriued, which ſignifieth a little forme or figure, and therefore euery figure or forme ſhould be called Idol.* *Cicero* likewiſe in his firſt Booke *De finibus* ſaith, [b] *Images which they call Idoles, by meeting with whome we both ſee and thinke:* Taking Image and Idoll for one thing. *Chryſoſtome* in his tenth Homilie vpon the third Chapter of the Epiſtle to the Philippians ſaith, [c] *We beautifie and ſet out our houſes, by placing Idols and Images in them.* And *Xiphilinus* the Abridger of *Dion*, in the life of *Seuerus*, in ſtead of ſaying that there was an Image or figure of waxe at the funerall pompe of the Emperour *Pertinax*, repreſenting the dead Emperour, he ſaith, [d] *That there was an Idoll of waxe triumphantly adorned.* In all theſe places and infinite others, Image and Idoll ſignifie one ſelfe-ſame thing, and the word Idoll is taken in good part, and ſimply ſignifieth a reſemblance or repreſentation. Reade *Iſidore* in his eight booke of Originals, cap. *De Dijs Gentium.*

117. *Sect.*

[a] *Idos Græcè formulam ſonat, ab eo diminutiuum Idolum dedubium, atque apud nos formulam facit: Igitur omnis forma vel formula idolum dici expoſcit.*

[b] *Imagines quæ idola nominant, quorum ſpectatione non ſolum videamus ſed etiam cogitemus.*

[c] εἰκόνας κατασκευάζομεν πανταχοῦ εἴδωλα πυρτὰ. χῶ ἔξωθεν ἐστὶν εἴδωλον πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον. ἀκούσῃ εἰκόνα μιᾶς ἐπιθυμίας.

Therefore *Iohannes Molanus* appointed to be Cenſor and Examiner of the Nomenclator of *Adrian Iunius*, vpon the chapter of the Tooles or Moueables of the Church, giueth this cenſure, ſaying, *The Nomenclator hath not done amiſſe to take the words ſtate, carued repreſentation, Image, Idoll, and figure, all for one thing. Neuertheleſſe, the Reader ought to remember, that ſome of theſe words, by the vſe of the Scripture, and Eccleſiaſticall Authors, are taken in euil part.*

Non malè Nomenclator, ſtatuam, ſculptile, imaginem, ſimulacrum, idolum pro iisdem habet.

Theſe words therefore in their proper ſignification, ſignifie all one thing. But common vſe hath reſtrained the ſignification of the word *Idoll*, in ſuch ſort that now it is taken in

euill part: and in the new Teſtament written in Greeke, the word Idoll is taken for the Image of a falſe god, or for an Image which men do abuſe vnto idolatrie. From whence it followeth, that he ſhould be thought to ſpeake amiſſe, that ſhould ſay that Ieſus Chriſt is the Idoll of the inuiſible God, in ſtead of ſaying, the Image: or that ſhould ſay, that God made man according to his Idoll or likeneſſe. In this ſence, and according to the common vſe, Image is more generally vſed then Idoll, and euery Idol is an Image, but euery Image is not an Idoll.

The words by the which God in his Law forbiddeth vs to make any *grauen Image, or the likeneſſe* of any things which are in heauen aboue or in the earth below, are *Peſel* and *Themunah*; whereof the laſt ſignifieth euery Image and reſemblance, but the firſt ſignifieth a grauen Image or figure, and is not taken in euill part, but when the ſence and circumſtance of the place conſtraines vs to take it for an Image forbidden, and which is abuſed to Idolatrie. Therfore the word *Peſel* by the Greeke Interpreters is tranſlated γλυπτὸν, which ſignifieth a carued or grauen Image, as in the firſt verſe of the 26. Chapter of Leuiticus, and Deuter. Chap. 4. 16, 25: and chap. 5. 8. and in many other places: and ſomtime εἴδωλὸν, *Idolum*, as Exod. Chap. 20. 4. ſometime εἰκὼν, which ſignifieth *Image and reſemblance*, as Eſay chap. 40. 18, 20. The Romiſh tranſlation ordinarily tranſlateth *Peſel*, *ſculptile*, that is, a grauen Image, and alſo an Image or repreſentation, ſpecially in theſe places alledged out of Exodus, Leuiticus, Deuternomie, and Eſay.

Our Aduerſaries, which make a controuerſie about theſe words, thereby to hinder the examination of things, will haue men to tranſlate the ſecond Commandement of God in this manner; *Thou ſhalt make no grauen Idoll, nor any reſemblance of things which are in heauen, &c.* and ſay, that Idoll is the reſemblance of a thing which is not, but that Image is the repreſentation of a thing which is; wherein they contradict their owne Bible. Theſe are the very words whereby this commandement is ſet downe, Deut. 5. 8. in the French Bible

Bible translated in Louaine, and approued by the Faculty of Diuines there: *Thou shalt make no grauen representation, nor any likenesse whatsoeuer, of that which is in heauen, &c.* And in Deuter. 4. 16 *To the end, lest peraduenture being deceiued, you should make to your selues a grauen similitude, or the Image of male or female.* And Esay 40. 18. *To whom then haue you likened God, and what Image do you set for him?* In which places the word *Pesel*, which our Aduersaries would haue translated, *a grauen Idoll*, is translated in our Aduersaries Bible, *resemblance, Image, and grauen representation.* And their Latine Bible hath, *Non facies tibi sculptile: Thou shalt not make any carued or grauen Image.*

And whereas in this Commandement they will haue *Idoll* to signifie the representation of a thing that is not, it proceedeth from a voluntarie blindnesse; for the words following, *Nor resemblance of things which are in heauen, &c.* shew, that God speaketh of the Images of things which are. It is true that S. *Paul*, 1. Cor. 10. 19, 20. saith, that the Idol is nothing, because it is not diuine thing, but onely wood or stone; but that may also be said of the Images of things which are, and that become Idols when religious seruice is attributed vnto them. And it is certaine, that although the Sunne and the Moone are fixed and seene, yet to adore the Sunne and the Moone, is Idolatrie.

Of the Images of God, and of the Trinitie.

The Temples of the Romish Church are full of Images of the Trinitie; they paint an old man sitting in a chaire, apparelled like a Pope, with a Papall triple crowne, and a robe, to the end (it may be) that he should be respected because of his clothes. They also make a Pigeon hanging at his beard, and a Crucifixe in his armes. Such pictures are printed at the beginnings or titles of the Bibles printed at Rome, by authoritie of the Popes, *Sixtus* the fifth and *Clement* the eight. They also serue for Signes for Alehouses and Innes, which is a common thing in Paris: where they say, *Monsieur is lodged* 118. *Sect.*

at the Trinitie, and his men at Gods head, making a deriſion of the diuine nature. The title of the eight Chapter of *Bellar.* booke of Images, is, *That the Images of God are not forbidden*, That ſeemes to be done, to render to God as much as he hath done for vs. For ſeeing that God hath made man according to his Image; man, in recompence, makes God according to mans Image.

This error is of late times crept into the Church of Rome, by the conniuence of an obſcure age, wherein the holy Scriptures being taken away, the people had no other knowledge of God, then that which was giuen them in Pictures. The ſecond Councell of Nice, wherein it is ordained that Images ſhould be adored, exempteth the Images of God, as a thing whereof as then they ſpeake not. *Baronius* [a] in the 726. yeere of his Annales ſpeaketh of two Epiſtles written by Pope *Gregorie* the ſecond, a great defender of Images; in the firſt whereof he ſaith, that they painted the Sonne, but not the Father; ſaying, *Why do wee not ſet before mens eyes and paint the Father of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt? Becauſe we know not what he is, and the nature of God cannot bee painted nor ſet foorth to mens ſight.* Whereupon *Baronius* noteth in the margent, that ſince that time they haue vſed to paint God in Churches, and found it requiſite ſo to do, againſt that Popes determination. *Nicephorus* a new Author, [b] *in libr. 8. cap. 53.* ſaith, *The Armerian heretickes paint the Image of God the Father, and of the holy Ghoſt, which is moſt abſurd.* *Auentine*, *libr. 7.* of the Bauarian hiſtorie ſaith, that Pope *Iohn* the 22. which liued *in anno* 1318. calleth certaine men that dwelt in [c] Bohemia and Auſtria, *Antropomorphites*, (that is, men which thought God to haue humane ſhape and members) becauſe they painted the diuine maieſtie in forme of an old man, with a young man and a pigeon; and condemned them to bee burnt. And among the new doctors of the Romiſh Church, *Durand*, *Abulenſis*, and *Pereſius*, condemne thoſe Images, and will not haue the Image of the Trinitie to bee painted in any manner.

1. Againſt this abomination we haue a formall commande-

ment

a *Cur tandem Patrem Domini Ieſu Chriſti non oculis ſubiicimus ac pingimus? Quoniam quis ſit non nouimus, Deique natura ſpectanda proponi non poteſt ac pingi.*

b *Imagines Patris & Spiritus Sancti effigiant, quod perquam abſurdum eſt.*

c *Quoſdam qui in finibus Bohemiæ atque Auſtriæ ſupremam illam maieſtatem, ſenis, adoleſcentis, columbæ imagine pingebant, laſæ religionis accerſuit, Anthropomorphitas eſſe renunciauit, quoſdam ad ignem condemnauit.*

ment in the firſt Table of the Law of God, according to our Aduerſaries tranſlation: *Thou ſhalt not make vnto thy ſelfe any grauen repreſentation, or likeneſſe whatſoeuer of that which is in heauen, &c.* Deut. 5. 8. Could he more expreſly forbid the making of the likeneſſe of God which is in heauen? And in the 4. of Deut. 15.16. it is ſaid, *Take ye therefore good heed vnto your ſelues, (for ye ſaw no maner of ſimilitude on the day that the Lord ſpake vnto you in Horeb out of the midſt of the fire) leſt ye corrupt your ſelues, and make you a grauen Image, the ſimilitude of any figure, the likeneſſe of male or female.* And Eſay 40.18. *To whom then will you liken God, or what likeneſſe will you compare vnto him?* In all theſe places it is formally forbidden to make any reſemblance of God, or to repreſent him by Images, and that according to the tranſlation receiued in the Church of Rome, as alſo in the Hebrew text.

2 Therefore, neither in the ancient Tabernacle, nor in *Salomons* temple, was there any picture or Image of God, although it was then a time of ſhadowes and figures.

3 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, Rom. 1. 23. among the cauſes for the which God blinded the Gentiles, placeth this for one, *Becauſe they turned the glorie of the incorruptible God, into the ſimilitude of the Image of a corruptible man.*

4 And without the Word of God, Reaſon it ſelfe is moſt euident and plaine againſt it: for euery Image and repreſentation, ought in ſome ſort to reſemble that which it repreſenteth. Now what reſemblance can an infinite Spirit haue with a piece of wood? an inuiſible and immateriall ſubſtance, with a viſible picture? or a Spirit without body, with a ſubſtantiall Image? What King will endure to haue his picture made like a Frog or an Ant? and yet the diſtance and difference betweene the greateſt Monarch in the world and the leaſt creature that is, is not infinite, for that both the one and the other are finite. But betweene God which is infinite, and a mortall creature, what excellencie ſoeuer it is of, the diſtance and inequalitie is infinite. For this our Aduerſaries bring ſome ſlender excuſes, not for an anſwer, but becauſe they will not ſeeme to ſay nothing.

They ſay, that in repreſenting of God, they intend not to repreſent his eſſence. But it is to no purpoſe to ſhew to what end men repreſent God by Images, ſeeing the commandement giuen by God not to repreſeut him by Images, is generall and without exception. And it is certaine, that no man was euer ſo brutiſh, as to thinke he could repreſent the eſſence of God in a picture, ſeeing that it is impoſſible to paint the eſſence of a man or of the leaſt beaſt that is. By this diſtinction then it may be ſaid, that the prohibition which God ſo expreſly maketh (with threatnings) not to repreſent him by any Image, is made to no body, ſeeing that no man euer went about to repreſent the eſſence of God. And there is no Pagan idolater but may excuſe himſelfe by this meanes.

6 They adde, that the Scripture attributeth feete, hands, eyes, and a mouth to God; and therefore that we may repreſent God in the ſame forme. This argument hath as good reaſon as if they ſhould ſay, Becauſe the Scripture in words maketh figures, let vs alſo make Images of ſtones; let vs paint God with wings, and in forme of a bird; or let vs paint him like a rocke, or like a fountaine, or like a Lion, becauſe the Scripture ſaith that God couereth vs with the ſhadow of his wings, and calleth him our rocke, the fountaine of life, & compareth him to a Lion. This reaſon therefore is without reaſon: for the word of God which attributeth feete, hands, and eyes vnto God, expoundeth it ſelfe, and oftentimes elſewhere declareth, that God is a Spirit, and that he is infinite. But the Images of God expound not themſelues, and there are no other Images that ſpeake to preuent the error and the groſſe conceit. The people of God, and all the Patriarks and Prophets vnderſtood not this ſubtilty; for from thoſe figuratiue words whereby God ſpake vnto them, they drew no ſuch ſtrange conſequence, neither tooke any liberty thereby to erect Images to God.

7 The reaſon enſuing, which is that whereof they make the greateſt ſhew, doth alſo make againſt themſelues. They ſay, that God ſometime appeared in forme of a man, as to *Daniel* in the forme of an old man. From whence they inferre, that

that we may paint God in the ſame forme wherein he appeared. But they ought rather to reaſon thus, and to ſay that God appeared to *Daniel* in the forme of a man, and yet the Church at that time did not repreſent God in that forme, but obeyed the commandement of God, which forbiddeth them *to corrupt themſelues, by making vnto God any Image either of male or female*, Deut. 4. Therefore we ought to do as the Church at that time did, and obey the commandement of God. For here we argue not what God hath done, but what God will haue vs to do. The commandements and not the actions of God, are the rules of our liues. It is by his commandement and not by his apparitions that wee ſhall bee iudged at the latter day. It is mad religion, to violate the commandement of God, and to counterfeit his actions: as if a man ſhould deſpiſe the Law of God, and go about to counterfeit thunder. And I cannot find that God euer appeared in that forme wherein the Church of Rome repreſents him. He neuer appeared with a Miter with three Crownes, in a Popes robe, nor ſet in a Pontificall chaire.

8. *Bellarmine* was not aſhamed to reaſon in this māner: God made man according to his Image: then we may make Images of God. But this Cardinall, which playes with God, and maketh a ieſt of his word, is not ignorant that man is created after the Image of God, becauſe his ſoule is illuminated with knowledge, and his will adorned with righteouſneſſe and holineſſe: thoſe are the lineaments and prints of the Image of God. In this ſence it is good and neceſſary that man ſhould frame himſelfe after the Image of God. But from this, that God hath created man with righteouſneſſe and holineſſe, to inferre, that man may paint God after the Image of man, is to haue more need of a Phyſicion then of a teacher, and of purgation then of inſtruction.

Lib. 2. de reliquiis & imaginibus Sanctorum, cap. 8. §. Quinto.

Whether it be lawfull to ſet vp pictures and Images of the Saints that are dead in the Church, for aides and helps of pietie and deuotion.

119. Sect. The Romish Churches are full of Images and pictures diuersly adorned & set forth, one with a sword; another with keyes, another with a hog, as Saint *Anthonie*; another with a dog, as S. *Roc*; another with rats and mice, as S. *Radegond*; and those beasts also haue part of the incense, and are as much lighted with candles as the Saints themselues. Saint *Anthonie* could not reade, yet ouer the gate of Saint *Anthonies* Abbey, not far from Paris, hee is made with a booke in his hand. There are diuers Images of Saints which are poorely clad: and there are many Images of one Saint, one apparelled in silke laid on with lace of gold, and which oftentimes changeth his apparell; another dustie, and before whom they light not many candles. Hard by an image clothed in white damaske, you shall see one starke naked, which is the Image of God. At the death of a Prince you shall see both hee and shee Saints clad in blacke, and our Lady enduring part of the affliction. They say, they are helpes in deuotion, yet they hide them in Lent time, which is the time of deuotion. They call them the bookes of the ignorant, but are no remedies against ignorance. Also there are many Images of Saints which neuer were in the world, and which are Saints and neuer were men. As the three Kings, S. *Longis*, S. *Vrsula*, S. *Catherine*, S. *Margaret*, S. *Martiall*, S. *Christopher*, and the 11. thousand virgins, &c. And if an Idoll be the Image of a thing which is not, it is certaine that such Images are idols, and by consequent, those that serue them, are idolaters.

The naturall inclination of man hath hatched this abuse, but the subtiltie and policie of the Bishop of Rome hath bin the nurse thereof. For naturally man loueth Images: euen little children loue babies, specially if they be finely cloathed, and hauing set them in some eminent place, beare them I know not what respect. This childish humour hath crept into Religion: and as babies are childrens idols, so Images and pictures are mens babies. For in regard that al our knowledge commeth by sense, man desireth to see an obiect of sensible deuotion, and will haue something to bind or prouoke his attention. Whereunto also the pleasure of the eye and easinesse

inui

inuiteth him. For it is an easier thing to see pictures, then to comprehend doctrines, and to forme prayers to the Image of man; then to forme man to the Image of God.

Popes by their subtilty haue dexterously serued their turns with this inclination, to withdraw the light of the Scripture from the people, that in a darke night they might lay the foundation of their Empire. For the people did easily neglect instruction, when they fed them with recreation, and were vsed to haue Images in stead of sacred books, pictures for doctrines, and candles lighted at noone day, in stead of the light of the holy Scripture, which driueth away the obscuritie of ignorance. And we see in Histories, that as fast as ignorance increased, Images also multiplied, and the Popes Empire was strengthened.

Against this permission to fill the Church with Images, we haue the commandement of God, which not only forbiddeth to serue Images or to worship them, but also to make them. For the first table of the Law is expressly made to order religion and the seruice of God. I say then, that in matter of religion God forbiddeth to make Images. The words are very direct: *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen Image, nor the likenesse of any thing that is in heauen aboue, or in the earth below, or in the waters vnder the earth; Thou shalt not bow downe to them nor worship them.* There it is manifest, that in matter of religion and pietie, he forbiddeth two things; one to make any Image or likenesse of things that are in heauen or earth: the other, to bow downe to them or worship them. He saith not, *Thou shalt make no grauen Image, to worship it*, but he saith, *Thou shalt make no grauen Image, nor worship it.* For although the end for the which Images are forbidden in matter of religion, is for feare lest men should fall into idolatrie by worshipping them, yet God knowing that man is naturally giuen to Idolatry, did not onely forbid the worship of Images, but also the making of them for any religious vse, and hath prohibited the meanes and inducements thereunto for feare of the end. The like prohibition is made, Leuit. 26. 1. *You shall make you no idols, nor grauen Image, neither reare you vp*

a

a ſtanding Image, neither ſhall you ſet you vp any Images of ſtone in your land to bow downe to it. For I am the Lord your God.

Therefore alſo the Iſraelites in their Temple and in their Synagogues, had not the Images of *Abraham*, *Iacob*, *Moſes*, *Samuel*, nor *Dauid*; perſons neuertheleſſe which were of as much worth as S. *Iuniper*, or S. *Amador*.

Irenæus lib. 1. chap. 23. and 24. ſaith, that the Gnoſtiques [a] *had certaine painted Images, and others made of other matter, ſaying that they were the figures of Chriſt made by Pilate.*

Saint *Auguſtine* in his Booke of Hereſies, chap. 7. ſpeaking of the Carpocratians ſaith, [b] *They ſerued the Images of Ieſus, worſhipping them, and offering incenſe vnto them.* The Colyridians are blamed for the ſame by *Epiphanius* in his 79. Hereſie, who alſo being at Anablata, tore a veile in a Church wherein there was a picture of Chriſt or of ſome other Saint, ſaying that it was cõtrary to the authority of the Scriptures, as he reciteth in an Epiſtle tranſlated by S. *Hierome*, and which is found in the ſecond Tome of the ſaid S. *Hieromes* Epiſtles.

The 36. Canon of the Councell of Eliberia, held at the ſame time that the Councell of Nice was holden, ſaith thus: *It hath bene ordained, that there ſhould bee no pictures in Churches, for feare leſt men ſhould adore that which is painted vpon the walles.*

Our aduerſaries reaſons to the contrary are rather excuſes and ſhifts then proofes. They ſay, that Images are the bookes of the ignorant; and they ſay true: for they maintaine ignorance. It is hard for them that haue choſen ſtones to be their teachers, to attaine to any inſtruction: as S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, [c] *Thus they deſerue to be ſeduced, which haue ſought Ieſus Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, not in the holy Scriptures, but in painted walles.* The bookes of the ignorant are good when they are a remedy of ignorance. Such are the ſacred bookes of the old and new Teſtaments, which they hide from the people, leſt they ſhould inſtruct the ignorant. And it is not without a myſterie, that in Lent, which is the time of preaching, they hide the Images: to ſhew that Images ought to hide and draw them-

[a] *Etiam imagines quaſdam depictas, quaſdam de reliqua materia fabricatas, dicentes formam Chriſti factam à Pilato.*

[b] *Colebant imagines Ieſus eas adorando & incenſum ponendo.*

Placuit in Eccleſijs picturas eſſe non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur in parietibus pingatur.

[c] *Aug. de Conſenſu Euang. lib. 1. cap. 10. Sic omnino errare merentur, qui Chriſtum & Apoſtolos eius non in ſanctis codicibus, ſed in pictis parietibus naſcuntur.*

themselues out of the way before the preaching of the Gospell. And certainely they would hide themselues for euer, if that which is preached in the Church of Rome, were the doctrine of the Gospell. The Prophet Habakuk, chap. 2. 18. calling the Images of Idolaters, *teachers of lyes*, without doubt answereth the Pagans and Iewes that were Idolaters, which made the like excuse. And *Athanasius* in his Oration against the Gentiles saith, that Pagan idolaters made this excuse, saying, That Images *serued men in stead of bookes, wherein reading, they might comprehend the knowledge of God.* And a little after, * *If these things serue you for bookes, as you falsly alledge, to behold and contemplate God.*

κ) εἶναι τοῦτο ὃ περὶ ἡμῶν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὅτι ἐπιστήμονες δύνανται γινώσκειν θεὸν ἐκ τῶν θείων κατανοοῦντες.

* εἰ γὰρ ὠφελίμως κατασκευὴν ἔσην ὑμῖν ταῦτα, ὡς ψευδῶς λέγετε, τῆς θεωρίας.

They also say, that *Moses* by Gods commandement made a Serpent of brasse, which was a figure of Iesus Christ, in that it healed the bitings of the old Serpent which is the diuell. But speaking in this manner, they make answer vnto themselues, and confute their Images. For they say that *Moses* made that Serpent by the expresse commandement of God, but they set vp Images of Saints in the Church without Gods commandement, and against his commandement. And it is false that the Serpent was properly an Image of Iesus Christ, (how soeuer it were a type of Christs grace:) for what resemblance had the forme of a Serpent with the humanity of the Sonne of God? Considering also that our aduersaries say, that Idols are figures of things which are not, but that Images are figures of things that are. But then the humanity of Christ was not; and therefore the brazen Serpent could not bee an Image of Iesus Christ: howbeit the sauing vertue which God displayed in the Serpent, was an example and a figure of the sauing efficacie of Iesus Christ, & of the healing of our soules by his vertue. The figure was not in that heape of brasse, but in the healing.

They also alledge the Images of the Cherubins or Angels placed vpon the Arke by Gods commandement. But what makes that for the Images of Saints, which God hath not commanded? And yet it is false that those Cherubins were the Images of any Angell; for let them tell me of which of the

Angels

Angels those Cherubins were figures? As also that the resemblance of Angels which are inuisible and incorporeall, cannot be made in any corporall figure. Then we must say, that those Cherubins were not the Images of any Angels, but symboles & characters of their office, in the same manner as men paint vertues and vices. So we paint Enuie leane, Pride swolne and puft vp, Iustice with a sword and a paire of ballances. Which symbolicall pictures produced diuers Saints, as S. *Christopher*, S. *Margaret*, and S. *George*, which were not the Images of any Saints that euer liued in the world, but figures and characters of Christians, and combats of faith, as *Baronius* in his booke of Martyrs is oftentimes constrained to confesse.

Being put from these weake proofes, they alwayes returne to this, that we must translate, *Thou shalt make no grauen idol*, and not, *grauen Image*. But what neede haue wee to dispute hereof, seeing that the words following do anoyd the disputation? for God addeth, *Nor resemblance or similitude whatsoeuer*. These words cut it cleane off, and admit no exception. Besides, we haue shewed before, that our aduersaries * Bibles, both Latine and French, translate the words as we do, *grauen Image, or representation*.

Our aduersaries themselues sufficiently shew, that this commandement displeaseth them, seeing they haue taken it out of their Ladies Houres and Seruice bookes, which they suffer the poore people to reade. Behold word for word how the first table of * the Law is set down in our Ladies Houres after the manner of Rome, and which at this day are most vsed.

1. Commandement.

I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt not haue nor worship any other God but me.

2. Commandement.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine.

3. Commandement.

Remember to keepe holy the Sabbath day, and feasts.

With the like corruption they haue put the commandements of God into verse, where the prohibition to make any grauen Image is cleane omitted. So the Councell of Ausbourg

* The Latine hath *sculptile*, in the 20. of Exod. The French hath *representation* in the 5. of Deut.

* Printed at Paris by *Henrenux Blanuilain* in S. Victors Streete at the signe of the three Moores anno 1611.

bourg which is in the laſt Tome of Councels, holden anno 1548. puts the Commandements of God in high Dutch as they are to be propounded to the people, wherein there is no ſpeech of Images, nor of the reſemblance of things which are in heauen or in earth.

One onely God thou ſhalt adore, and loue him perfectly. Thou ſhalt not ſweare by Gods Name in vaine.

Herein our aduerſaries do as he doth that out of ten bags of mony ſtealeth one, and then puts one of the nine that are left into two bags, to the end that his theft may not be perceiued. For hauing taken one out of the ten Commandements of the Law, they cut the laſt into two, making the not coueting of a mans wife the ninth Commandement, and the not coueting of the houſe, the manſeruant and the maid-ſeruant, &c. the tenth. By this meanes they might make 14. Commandements, if on euery thing whereof God forbiddeth the coueting, they would make a Commandement apart. But God, by his prouidence hath taken all excuſe from our aduerſaries: for in the 20. of Exodus the not coueting of our neighbors wife, which they make the ninth commandement, is thruſt into the middle of the tenth, and put after the not coueting of our neighbours houſe, whereby it followeth, that according to the Church of Rome, in the 20. of Exodus there is no ninth Commandement.

Whereupon we ſhould giue them good matter to make foule exclamations againſt vs, if we ſhould follow them. For what would they ſay of vs, or rather what would they not ſay, if we had bene ſo bold as to cut off or to ſuppreſſe one onely ſyllable of that moſt ſacred Law which God pronounced by his owne mouth, and wrote with his finger in Tables of ſtone? which he publiſhed from the midſt of the fire and the ſmoke with an extraordinary maieſtie? Shall wormes of the earth be ſo audacious to correct the Law of God, or to find any thing ſuperfluous therein? Wil men be ſo bold to enterpriſe to cut off and to change the ſoueraigne Law by the which they muſt be iudged at the latter day? to the end that they may be culpable, to haue not onely tranſgreſſed the Law by diſobedience, but alſo to haue pared it through contempt, yea & to haue made it ſhorter by a Commandement, where-

in

in God ſpeaketh with great maieſtie, calling himſelfe ſtrong and iealous, and thereunto adding his threatnings and his promiſes?

Of adoration of Images, and of the ſeruice and worſhip which is yeelded and giuen vnto them.

220. *Sect.* The holy Scripture ſpeaketh of two adorations: one ciuill, the other religious. Ciuill adoration is that which is giuen to Princes and Superiors, yea although they bee wicked. So Geneſis 23. *Abraham* bowed himſelfe before the Hethites; & Geneſis 33. *Iacob* bowed himſelfe before his brother *Eſau*. In which places the Hebrew word is the ſame which we tranſlate to *worſhip*, when we ſpeake of the worſhip of God.

Religious adoration is an action of religion, whereby a reaſonable creature humbleth himſelfe before one, calling vpon him, and ſeruing him with ſeruice belonging to religion, appearing before him as before one that knoweth his heart and his thought, and that can heare his prayers. When we diſpute of the adoration of Images, we vnderſtand religious adoration: for this adoration is done in the Church, and by order from the Paſtors, and is an acte of religion, by the which in worſhipping the Images of Saints, men thinke they do ſeruice to God.

In this point the Church of Rome hath vnmeaſurably gone aſtray, and hath directly ſtriuen againſt God. The ſecond Councell of Nice, which the Church of Rome placeth among the generall Councels, whereof Pope *Adrian* the firſt was the procurer, aboue twenty times ordaineth that Images ſhould be adored: And finally for concluſion ſetteth downe this determination, which is found in the ſeuenth Act: *Wee hold that wee muſt adore and ſalute the Image of the Virgin Marie the vndefiled mother of God, and of the glorious*

glorious Angels, and of all the Saints. And that if any one be of a contrarie opinion, and doubteth or wauereth touching the adoration of venerable Images, our holy and venerable Synode holdeth him to bee accurſed. In the ſame Councell there is an Epiſtle written by Pope *Adrian* to *Tharaſius* Patriarch of Conſtantinople, where the ſayd Pope ſaith thus; *Let your Holineſſe perſeuer to ſerue and* [a] *adore the Images of all the Saints.* There alſo Images are aduanced to ſuch degree of excellencie and holineſſe, that in the fourth Action it is ſaid, *That* [b] *Images are of like and equall value with the holy Goſpell.* And, *Maior eſt Imago quàm oratio.* And to the end that men might paint Angels, it is ſaide in the fifth Action, *The Church* [c] *holdeth, that Angels are corporeall and not inuiſible, hauing a body either of aire or of fire.*

Now to the end that by *adoring* we ſhould not onely vnderſtand to *reuerence, honour* or *reſpect*, but alſo to yeeld and to giue them religious worſhip, the Patriarch *Tharaſius*, which was Preſident at that Councell, pronounced this ſentence in the 6. Action: *All thoſe which confeſſe that they reuerence Images, and neuertheleſſe refuſe to adore them, are reproued by the holy father Anaſtaſius to be hypocrites: for when they refuſe that adoration, which is a ſigne or marke of honour, it is manifeſt that they do the contrary, that is, that they ſpeake iniuriouſly of the Saints.*

Following this doctrine, our Aduerſaries haue written diuers bookes *De cultu Imaginum*: Of the worſhip of Images. Cardinall *Bellarmine*, in the 22. chapter of his booke of Images, will haue them to be adored, not onely in regard of that which they repreſent, but alſo in themſelues; ſaying, *The ordinarie adoration which men giue to externall Images, is in themſelues and properly.* And in the 21. chapter he ſetteth downe this maxime in great letters, ſaying, that [d] *the Images of Chriſt and of Saints ought to bee worſhipped, not onely by accident and improperly, but in themſelues and properly: in ſuch manner, that the worſhipping is limited to the Image conſidered in it ſelfe, and not onely in this, that it repreſenteth the perſon*

[a] *Imagines omnium Sanctorum beatitas veſtra colere & adorare pergat.*

[b] *Vt etiam meo iudicio cum ſanctis Euangelijs & venerandæ crucis æquiparent.*

[c] *Eccleſia ſentit non omnino eſſe corporis expertes & inuiſibiles, verùm tenui corpore præditos aere ſine igneo.*

[d] *Imagines Chriſti & Sanctorum venerandæ ſunt, non ſolum per accidens, vel improprie, ita vt ipſæ terminent venerationem vt in ſe conſideratæ, & non ſolùm vt vicem gerunt exemplaris.*

perſon for whom it is made.

Gregorie de Valentia [e] the Ieſuite, in the ſecond booke of Idolatrie.chap.7. hath theſe words; *It is not abſurd to thinke, that Saint Peter would ſay, that ſome Religious ſeruice of Images (which are ſacred Images) is good, when hee would expreſly withdraw the faithfull from the vnlawfull worſhip of Idoles.* The reaſon is, ſeeing that Saint *Peter* forbiddeth the vnlawfull worſhip of Idols, it is a ſigne that there is a lawful worſhip.

But this is worſe, and ſuch as would make a mans haire to ſtand vpright vpon his head to heare it. *Vaſques* the Ieſuite, *De adoratione, lib.3. diſp 1. cap.2.p.458.* printed in Mogun-tia, *anno* 1601. in 8. [f] maintaineth, that all things, euen vn-reaſonable creatures and without life, may bee adored with God, as being his Image: In ſuch manner, that according to this Doctors opinion, men may worſhip a Frog or a Mouſe, conſidering them to be the Images of God, and in as much as God is preſent in them. Nay, he proceedeth further, to maintaine that it is lawful for Chriſtians to worſhip a ſtraw, ſaying, *The Wickleſſians invaine obiect against Chriſtians which worſhip Images, that they may as well adore a ſtraw, becauſe in it there appeared ſome ſigne or token of the Trinitie. For Leontius would as willingly haue confeſſed the ſame touching a ſtraw, which he confeſſeth of all other things; ſo farre off is it to bee thought to bee abſurd.*

Then ſeeing that the Doctors themſelues are ſo blinded, it is no maruell that the common people are ſo furiouſly ſu-perſtitious about the ſeruice and worſhip of Images. For [g] they fall down before them, t hey light Candles vnto them, they put coſtly apparell vpon them, and bring them offe-rings. In the beginning of Lent the people go on proceſſion to the Image of our Lady, to haue leaue to eate butter. Poore old women rub their kerchers vpon the feet of an Image, and then kiſſe them. The Catechiſme of the Councell of Trent

[e] Editionis Pariſ. p. 1610. *Nec abſurde putaueris S. Petrum inſi-nuaſſe cultum aliquem ſimu-lacrorum (nempe ſacrarum Imaginum) eſſe, cum fideles nominatim ab illiciti ſi idolorum cultibus deterre-re voluit.*

[f] *Non ſolum Imago depicta, & res ſacra au-thoritate publi-ca in cultum Dei expoſita, ſed quæuis etiam alia res mundi, ſiue inanima & irrationalis, ſiue rationalis ex na-tura rei, & ſe-cluſo periculo, rite, cum Deo ſi-cut Imago eius adorari poteſt. Ibi. §. 8 455. Quid quæſo obſtare poteſt quo minus quamcunque rem mundi cum Deo qui in ea eſt ſecundum eſſen iam & quam continua ſua virtute conſeruat, ſecluſo periculo, adorare & colere poſſimus? g Cap. De Oratione: Cum ad Imaginem Sancti alicuius orationem Dominicam pro-nuntiat, ita tum ſentiat, ſe tum ab illo petere vt ſecum oret.*

thinks

thinks it good, that before the Image of an hee or a shee Saint, men should say, *Our Father which art in heauen.* It is an ordinarie thing to speake to a piece of wood or to a painted Image as if it vnderstood them. There are particular prayers which are made to the Image of the face of Iesus Christ, printed in a piece of linnen cloth, wherein the words are directly spoken to the painted cloth and to the Image, and are not agreeable to Iesus Christ. The prayer saith, *I salute thee, oh holy face of the Redeemer, printed in a white cloth, giuen to Veronique in signe of loue. Cleanse vs from vices, and ioyne vs in society with the blessed. Oh blessed Image, and happy figure, cause vs to see the face of Iesus Christ.* With the like abuse, when they lift vp the Image of the Crosse, they say, *Aue lignum triumphale, All haile triumphant wood.* And, *Aue crux spes vnica, All haile ô crosse our onely hope, increase righteousnesse in the faithfull, and pardon sinnes.* This superstition beganne already to enter into the minds of some particular persons in Saint *Augustines* time, of whom he speaketh thus, Libr 1. cap. 34. of the Customes of the catholike Church, saying,* *I know that there are many worshippers of Sepulchers and Pictures: I know many which drinke exc essiuely ouer the dead.*

Salue sancta facies nostri Redemptoris. In qua nitet species diuini splendoris: Impressa panniculo niuei candoris.

Salue vultus Domini imago beata. Nos deduc ad propria ô felix figura la ad videndam faciem quæ est Christi iura.

**Nouimultos esse sepulcrorum & picturarum adoratores. Nouimultos qui super mortuos luxuriosissime bibant.*

Against this so prodigious an abuse, and so lamentable blindnesse, we haue the commandement of the Law of God, which our Aduersaries haue put out of their Ladies houres and Seruices; *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen Image, nor the likenesse of any thing which is in heauen aboue, nor in the earth below, nor in the waters vnder the earth, thou shalt not bow downe to them, nor worship them.* This word pronounced with thunder and lightning, as yet thundreth against idolatrie, and lighteneth darkenesse. So Iesus Christ said to the diuell, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serue.* Reade Leuit. 26. 1.

Against this so cleare and manifest word of God, accompanied with terrible threatnings, our aduersaries shroud themselues with weake reasons, as if a man should hide himselfe in the water against raine.

1 They conteſt about the words Idoll and Image, but the Bible of their owne tranſlation ſaith, *grauen Image* and *repreſentation*. And the general prohibition not to make any reſemblance of things which are in heauen or in earth which is added thereunto, ſtops all euaſions whatſoeuer.

2 They ſay that they reſerue all diuine worſhip called Latria vnto God, & yeeld an inferiour religious worſhip called Dulia, to Saints & their Images: but the Word of God ſpeaketh but of one religious ſeruice, & that it is to be performed to God onely. When the prohibition to adore Images is general in the Law, it belõgs not to man to make any reſtraints or exceptions againſt it, drawne out of their owne braines. Such diſtinctions are to be receiued, when they are contained in the Word of God. It belongs to the law-maker, and not to ſubiects, to make exceptions vpon the law. Now our aduerſaries neither bring places out of the Scripture, Commandement of God, nor any examples, which in any ſort do approue or eſtabliſh religious adoration of creatures. But on the contrary, in the Scripture this religious ſeruice which our aduerſaries call Dulia, is expreſly reſerued to God onely, with an expreſſe prohibition to attribute it to any other but to God. So in Sam. 1. 7. The Greeke hath ἑτοιμάσατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν πρὸς κύριον, καὶ δουλεύσατε αὐτῷ μόνῳ: *Direct or prepare your hearts to the Lord, and giue Dulia to him onely.* And *Paul*, Galat. 4. 8. τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες τὸν θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς, *Then when you knew not God, you gaue Dulia*, that is, you ſerued thoſe who by nature were no Gods. And whoſoeuer vnderſtandeth Greeke, knoweth that Latria is leſſe then Dulia; for Latria ſimply ſignifieth ſeruice of honour, reuerence, and ſubiection; but Dulia, beſides that, importeth a ſlauiſh ſeruitude. Saint *Auguſtine* in his 20. booke, cap. 21. againſt *Fauſtus* a Manichee, & in his queſtions vpon Geneſis, lib. 1. cap. 61. vſeth this diſtinction, but in contrary ſence to our aduerſaries. For he ſaith, that Dulia is giuen to men that are aliue, and conſequently by the word Dulia he vnderſtandeth no religious ſeruice. And in fine, who ſeeth not the peruerſity of this proceeding? For after they haue ſuppreſſed

the

he ſecond Commandement of the Law, if any one make it knowne to the people, they ſet before them a forged diſtinction of words in bad Greeke, which the people vnderſtand not, and which thoſe that are wiſe know to be miſtaken, raiſing vp a cloud of duſt with their Latria, Dulia, and Hyperdulia, to eſcape thorow this thicke miſt.

3 If theſe two ſorts of religious adoration were receiued, the proofes which the Scripture vſeth to proue the diuinity of Chriſt, would be weake and of no force. As when the Apoſtle, Heb. 1. 6. proueth Chriſts diuinity by that which is written of him, *That all the Angels of God worſhip him*; the enemies of his diuinitie would ſay, that there an inferior adoration is ſpoken of, which may be attributed to a creature.

4 They ſay, that the honour which men do to Images, turneth to the honor of that which they repreſent; which is the ſpeach of all Idolaters. So *Michaes* mother, Iudges 17. 3. determining to make a molten Image in the houſe of God, ſaid, *I had wholly dedicated the ſiluer vnto the Lord from my hand, for my ſonne to make a grauen Image.* And thereupon *Micha* perſwaded himſelfe that God would bleſſe him. It appeareth by the 5. and 6. verſes of the 18. Chapter, that the prayers made before that Image, were directed vnto God. The ſame excuſe a Pagan made kneeling on his knees before an Image, as S. *Auguſtine* ſaith vpon the 113. Pſalme, ſaying, *I worſhip not the Image, but thereby I repreſent vnto my ſelfe the reſemblance of that which I ſhould adore.*

5 If wee conſider what honours men yeeld and giue vnto Images of Saints, we ſhall finde that the honour is properly done to the Image, and that the Saint is neuer the more honored; and that *Bellarmine* hath reaſon to ſay, that the Image is worſhipped for it ſelfe. For when they cloath an Image, the Saint is adorned thereby; if they offer to an Image, the Saint hath no part thereof; if they ſet vp candles lighted before an Image, the Saint is not lighted therewith; if any man ſpeakes to an Image, the Saint eſteemeth himſelfe to be no more honored then if a King ſhould thinke himſelf to be honoured, when a man ſpeaketh to his picture before his face.

6 The abuſe is euident, in that our Aduerſaries to vntwine themſelues, twiſt intricate cords of darke words, giuing vs an adoration of Latria, Dulia, and Hyperdulia, and each of them either abſolute or relatiue; in ſuch manner, that there are ſixe ſorts of religious adoration which the people neither vnderſtand nor practiſe, who falling downe before an Image, come thither with all their deuotion, and deuide not their intents into ſo many parts. Whoſoeuer ſhall enter into the examination of theſe adorations, ſhall finde that in them there is not onely deceit and intricateneſſe, but alſo manifeſt fooliſhneſſe: for the laſt refuge of our aduerſaries is to ſay, that the adoration of Images is a relatiue adoration, and which hath regard to the thing repreſented by the Image. But that is nothing, for to adore an Image relatiuely, is ſtill to adore the Image; & to adore an Image hauing regard to the Saint which it repreſenteth, is no adoration of the Saint. And ſeeing that the adoration of the Image is relatiue, but the adoration of the Saint is abſolute and not relatiue, it followeth, that the adoration of the Saint and the adoration of his Image are two ſorts of adoration. And which is more, If this relatiue adoration be receiued, there is no creature in the world but it may be adored. So men may adore and worſhip the Sun, and the Moone, and beaſts, and trees, and ſay that ſuch adoration is relatiue to God, and that they adore them becauſe of him that created them, and in reſpect of him.

7 Adde hereunto, that all theſe diſtinctions ſerue onely to ſhew what the intent of the Church of Rome is, but not to ground this intention vpon the Word of God, nor to ſhew that God or the Saints approue this relatiue adoration. For if it were lawfull to worſhip and adore Saints, yet before we ſhould adore their Images with relatiue adoration, it were good to be aſſured that the Saints will be honoured in that ſort. Seeing it is not likely that a King would think himſelfe to be honoured by him that ſhould doe reuerence to his picture, or that ſhould ſpeake to his cloake, although he ſhould ſay, that the honour he doth is relatiue, and the reuerence reſpectiue.

8 They

8 They adde, that the abuſe offered to an Image, redoundeth to him that is repreſented by that Image; whence, ſay they, it followeth, by a reaſon drawne from contraries, that the honour which is done to an image, is an honour to him that is repreſented thereby. I anſwer, it is falſe that the diſgrace done to an Image doth alwayes diſgrace him that is repreſented thereby: for oftentimes he which is repreſented, hateth that repreſentation. So the King ordaineth that his Image ſtamped vpon falſe money, ſhall be cut in pieces, and molten. The Iſraelites worſhipped the brazen Serpent in honour of God, and yet *Ezechias* did well to breake downe that Serpent; for it is not credible that thoſe which worſhipped that brazen Serpent, did beleeue that piece of braſſe was the ſoueraigne God: but they referred an inferiour adoration vnto it, in remembrance of the vertue which God had ſhewed thereby.

9 They mend the matter much, by ſaying that they worſhip not the Images of falſe gods, as the Pagans did, but the Images of the friends and ſeruants of God. For we muſt not tranſport that religious ſeruice which is due to God onely, to his friends nor to his enemies. If it be euill to honour euill things, it is euill to abuſe good things, & to vſe Gods friends to prouoke him to iealouſie. Idolatrie in the Scripture is called adultery. A woman is not excuſable, although ſhe giueth her body adulterouſly to none but to her husbands friends. This excuſe then ſhall be allowed, when they haue proued that God will haue the Images of his ſeruants to be adored.

10 They alſo alledge a company of falſe miracles done by Images. But if they were true, doth it follow that we muſt adore al that whereby God hath done miracles? Then we muſt adore the Aſſes iaw which *Samſon* vſed, *Moſes* rod, and the water of Iordan which healed *Naaman*, and many ſuch like things.

11 Wanting reaſons, they haue recourſe to the Scripture, hoping that that will ſerue them without reaſon. The ſecond Councell of Nice, and Pope *Adrian* which expreſly made a declaration for the defence of that Councel, with a ridiculous

ſubtiltie collected an heape of places out of the Scripture for the adoration of Images: as in the ſecond of Cant. it is ſaid, Acts 6. *Shew me thy face, and let me heare thy voice.* In the ſecond of Geſ. it is ſaid, *God made man after his owne Image.* And Exod. 18. *Moſes* bowed downe to *Iethro* his father in law. And Rom. 15. *Paul* ſaith, *That all things which are written, are written for* Acts 4. *our inſtruction.* And Pſalme 47. *As we haue heard, ſo we haue* Acts 6. *ſeene.* And Luke 18. *No man after he hath lighted a candle, ſetteth it vnder a buſhell.* Vpon theſe places theſe reuerend Fathers ground the adoration of Images. They forgot *Goliahs* combat with *Dauid*, and *Samſons* foxes, for thoſe may be alledged to as good purpoſe for the adoration of Images. Whoſoeuer doth not acknowledge the abſurditie of theſe proofes, is blinder then Images themſelues.

12. New commers vſe other weapons. *Bellarmine* in the 12. Chap. of his booke of Images, ſaith that the Iewes worſhipped the Cherubins placed vpō the Arke. Firſt I ſay, if that be true, it muſt needs be that God commanded it, but that is no where to be found. Secondly, if the Iſraelites adored the Cherubins, they would much more haue adored the Angels figured, as they ſay, by thoſe Cherubins; which before we haue ſhewed to be falſe. Thirdly, if the Iſraelites adored the two Cherubins placed vpon the Arke, then the Cherubins muſt needs haue bene the Images of ſome certaine Angels, otherwiſe they ſhould haue adored they knew not what. In the Church of Rome it ſelfe they worſhip not an Image whoſe name they know not, and what Saint it repreſenteth: but thoſe Cherubins had no names, nor were the figures of any particular Angels. Then to worſhip them, had bene a ſeruice done to an vnknowne Cherubin, as in Athens they worſhipped the vnknowne God. Fourthly, adde hereunto, that if the Iſraelites adored thoſe Images, then it muſt needs be that they ſaw them. But the Cherubins were ſhut vp in the Sanctuarie, and the people ſaw them not, no more then thoſe that were painted in the curtaines in the holy place. And for the ſpace of 500. yeeres and more after *Salomons* time, the people ſaw them not. God, by taking them away from the peoples

Imagines Cherubin ſuper arca exiſtentes neceſſariò adorabantur ab iis qui arcam adorabant.

ſight,

ſight, preuented idolatrie. Fiftly and laſtly, put the caſe that the people did adore the Arke, (which neuertheleſſe is falſe) yet thereby it followeth not, that they adored the Cherubins placed vpon the Arke. He that ſaluteth the King, doth he ſalute his hat, or his clothes? There is neither reaſon nor apparence thereof.

13. In the end, failing of better proofes, they produce two notable falſifications of the Scripture. They ſay, that in the Pſalme 98. verſe 5. it is ſaid, *Worſhip the ſtoole vnder his feete.* From whence they draw this ridiculous conſequence, that we muſt adore Images. But according to the Hebrew it is, *Worſhip towards the ſtoole vnder his feete.* So the holy place is called, towards the which the people turned their faces when they worſhipped. In the ſame manner & termes as it is ſaid in the laſt v. of the ſame Pſal. *Worſhip toward the mountaine of his holineſſe*: The Chaldean Paraphraſe expounds it ſo, & *Nicolas de Lira*, *Pagninus*, and *Arias Montanus* do the like. It is true, that to adore God, or to fall downe before God, are all one thing. And when we ſpeake of ciuil adoration, to worſhip the King, or to kneele before the King, is all one. But when we ſpeake of things inſenſible, to kneele downe before an Altar, or before a mountaine, is not to adore the altar or the mountaine: ſpecially in matter of religious adoration, which God hath reſerued to himſelfe onely, and which is directed by his commandement.

14 With the like falſeneſſe and to the ſame end, they alledge Hebrewes, 11. 21. where it is ſaid according to the Romane tranſlation, that *Iacob dying, bleſſed both the ſonnes of Ioſeph, and worſhipped the end of his ſtaffe.* But in the Greeke it is, προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ, he worſhipped vpon the end of his ſtaffe. The ſecond Councell of Nice in the ſecond Act tranſlateth faithfully, ſaying, *Iacob in ſummitate virgæ adorauit*, and not *ſummitatem*. The Ieſuites *Ribera* and *Emanuel Sa*, tranſlate this place as we do. The thing is as cleare as day, and the falſification of the place moſt euident. *Adorauit faſtigiũ virgæ eius.*

Of Adoration or worshipping of the Crosse. And of the signe of the Crosse made in the aire.

121. Sect. The Crosse of Christ is the glory of the faithfull, the support of their hope, and their principall consolation. This Crosse is a terror to the diuels, the victory of hell, the death of death eternall. It is the body of the shadowes of the Law, the truth of figures, the substance of Prophecies, the foundation of the Couenant made with God, the effect of the Gospell. For in it consisteth our learning to know Iesus Christ and him crucified. This Crosse is more worth then kings Crowns; the sufferings of the Sonne of God surpasse the triumphs of mightie Monarkes, his death is more worth then the life of all men.

But by the Crosse of Christ I do not vnderstand a piece of wood, but the sufferings and passion of our Sauiour. Colo. 1. 18, 19. it is said, *For it pleased the Father by him to reconcile all things to himselfe, through peace made by that bloud of the Crosse.* God hath washed our soules in his bloud, and buried our sins in his death. There is nothing sweeter to our consciences then the remembrance of his bitternesse, nothing more honorable then this reproch.

Ancient Christians in *Tertullians* time, that is, 200. yeeres after the birth of our Lord, marked their foreheads with the signe of the Crosse, to witnesse that they were not ashamed of the Crosse of Christ. Not long after they proceeded to paint the figure of the Crosse. The *Labarum* or standard borne in the wars before the Emperors of Rome, namely, before *Constantine*, was made like a Crosse. But *Constantine* added thereunto the name of Christ, which made some say, that *Constantine* fixed the signe of the Crosse in his standard. Kings made that signe to be stamped vpon their moneys, and eleuated it in the flags of the ships of Christians. Vntil that time, here was nothing to be disliked therein.

But when deuotion began to degenerate and turne to superstition, euerie age adding some new thing, after that men

men had once learned to make wisedom e or comelinesse a rule, in stead of subiecting themselues to the rule of the word of God, this signe of the Crosse made both in the aire and painted, did insensibly change his nature. Men began to make the signe of the Crosse in the aire by forme of coniuration, to driue away diuels; and to make a precise multitude of Crosses vpon the host, and vpon the chalice by order; and if a Priest failed in that number, the mysterie was spoyled. Pope *Innocent* the third in his booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, cap. 58. saith, [a] *That the Priests make signes of the Crosse vpon the host, to withstand the force of diuels, lest they should preuaile against the Priest, or against the host*, which is Iesus Christ (if we will beleeue it.) This aide came in good time to Iesus Christ. This is no smal benefit that a Priest doth to his God, to defend him with signes of the Crosse made in the aire against the force of the diuell.

[a] *Efficit super ea crucis signaculum, vt per crucis virtutem omnes conatus diabolicæ malignitatis effugiat, ne contra sacerdotem vel sacrificium aliquo modo præualeant.*

With an abuse yet much worse, they adore little pieces of wood, which they say are pieces of the wood of the true Crosse, with diuine worship called Latria, that is, with the soueraigne adoration that belongeth to God onely; [b] as almost all the Doctors of the Romish Church teach. And they adore the Image of the Crosse with religious worship, as Cardinall *Bellarmine* in the 30. Chapter of his booke of Images saith, [c] *We worship all (crosses, because all of them are images of the true Crosse*, yea and simple Crosses without the crucifixe. *We adore* (saith he) *the Crosse it selfe without the crucifixe thereon.* Therefore also they offer incense vnto it, as we see in the Pontificall. And when they lift vp the Crosse, they say, *Ecce crux, adoremus.* Likewise they speake to the wood of the Crosse, saying, *Aue lignum triumphale*, All haile triumphant wood: and *O aue crux spes vnica, auge piis iustitiam, reisq; dona veniam*: I salute thee oh Crosse, our onely hope, increase righteousnesse in the faithfull, and pardon sinners. You must note that they do not worship the Image of the Crosse, but after it hath bene consecrated, and that he which did consecrate it, presently thereupon doth worship it, as the Pontificall teacheth, in the Chapter of the Blessing of a new Crosse;

[b] *Thomas 3. parte. Quæst. 5. Artic. 3. & 4. & Caietanus in Tho. mam. Ibid. Alexander 3. parte. Quæst. 30. art. vltimo. Bonauentura, Marcellus, Almain, Caribus, Sanus, Capreolus in 3. dist. 9. Henricus quodlibetico 10. 4 6. Nauarrus in Epist ad Rom c 1.*

[c] *Omnes crucis adoramus, quia omnes sint imagines veræ crucis.*

* and

* Hoc ſignum crucis tuæ ſit remedium ſalutare generi humano, ſit ſoliditas fidei, profectus bonarum operum, redemptio animarum, ſolatium & protectio ac tutela contra ſeua iacula inimicorum.

* and that when the Croſſe is bleſt, they beſeech God that that ſigne of the Croſſe may be a ſauing remedie, the redemption of ſoules, and a defence againſt the cruell arrowes of aduerſaires.

But we, who by ſo many afflictions and perſecutions haue learned to beare the Croſſe of Chriſt, and to glorie in his reproch, and which with the Apoſtle, Galat. 6. 14. ſay, *God forbid that I ſhould reioyce, but in the Croſſe of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, whereby the world is crucified vnto me, and I vnto the world*; becauſe of the abuſe, haue left off making the ſigne of the Croſſe, and painting it in our Churches, knowing how therein deceit is eaſie, and ſuperſtition credulous, and the effects dangerous, ſo farre as to worſhip a peece of wood with that worſhip which is due vnto God onely.

1 To begin then with adoration of pieces of the Croſſe: *Paul*, Rom. 14. 13. ſaith, that *whatſoeuer is not of faith, is ſinne:* and ſpeaketh this concerning the vſe of meates, in which that a man ſinnē not, he will haue him to vſe them in faith, that is to ſay, with aſſurance that God liketh that which he doth therein, and that it is not cōtrarie to his word: by greater reaſon we muſt haue this aſſurance in matters of adoration, and when queſtion is made touching the yeelding of religious ſeruice to the creature. Now it is impoſſible that he that worſhippeth a piece of wood, ſhould do it with that aſſurance. For firſt, how ſhal hebe aſſured that that chip of wood is a piece of the true Croſſe? ſeeing that if the wood of the Croſſe which at this day is kept in relickes, were all put together in a heape, it would be wood enough to load fiftie carts? ſpecially ſeeing there was a publicke trafficke made of that wood in our fathers times, and that theſame wood is diſtributed abroad like marchandiſe? In the yeere of our Lord 1239. *Iohn de Brennes* calling himſelfe King of Ieruſalem, hauing neede of money, ſold the Crowne of thornes to *Lewis* the ninth King of France, a meeke, vpright, and religious Prince according to the time, but eaſie to be circumuented: and the true Croſſe to the Venetians, who ſold the ſame againe for twice the value that they paid for it, to the ſaid King *Lewis*: who for thoſe relickes

relickes onely cauſed the holy Chappell in the palace of Paris to be built to keepe them in.

2 Secondly, it is impoſsible to worſhip pieces of wood, with aſſurance that God liketh of that adoration, ſeeing that God hath not commanded it, and that there is not one word ſpoken thereof in the Scripture: ſeeing alſo that God hath forbidden to worſhip and ſerue any other but himſelfe, as we haue proued in the precedent Section, and that the Prophets euery where condemne thoſe that worſhip wood or ſtone.

3 Adde hereunto, that if a piece of wood which men by coniecture ſuppoſe to be a piece of the true Croſſe, ought to be adored with religious worſhip, much more the whole Croſſe. And if at this day a piece of rotten worme-eaten wood ought to be worſhipped, by greater reaſon the whole Croſſe ought to haue bene adored when it ſtood vpright, and was yet bloudie and hot with the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt: and yet the Apoſtles did not then adore it, nor commanded the faithfull to adore it. It had bene an eaſie matter for euery one of them to haue cut a piece thereof to beare about them, to ſerue them for a preſeruatiue againſt euill aire, againſt thunder, and againſt the diuels; but they neuer thought vpon it. And not onely they, but alſo the Chriſtians after them for the ſpace of three hundred yeeres, left that Croſſe without once troubling themſelues to ſeeke for it. Certainly our aduerſaries by their ſcrupulous diligence accuſe the Apoſtles of careleſneſſe and negligence.

Bellarmine in his Booke of Images, cap. 20 and 22. perceiuing that in it there is an abuſe, oppoſeth himſelfe againſt that multitude of Doctors, who will haue the Croſſe to be worſhipped with diuine worſhip called Latria, which is due to God, & will haue the Croſſe to be worſhipped with an inferior worſhip; by that meanes making the worſhipping of the Croſſe to be another worſhip then that wherewith men worſhip the Crucifixe, which ought to haue ſoueraigne worſhip. And hereby he troubleth the imagination of the people, who worſhipping the Croſſe, thinke they do but one worſhip: but *Bellarmine* will haue them to do two at one time

and

and to cut their deuotion in two pieces. But howſoeuer hee pretend to adore the Croſſe with inferiour religious ſeruice, yet ſtill he yeeldeth religious ſeruice to the creature, and ſo incurreth that puniſhment ſet downe in the Law of God, againſt thoſe that ſerue the creature in ſtead of ſeruing God onely.

It is to no purpoſe for them to ſay, that the wood of the true Croſſe is to be worſhipped, becauſe it touched the body of Ieſus Chriſt. If that be ſo, that part of the Croſſe which touched the body of our Lord, ought to be more worſhipped then that part which touched it not. And by that reaſon we muſt worſhip the ground whereon Chriſt went, & the riuer wherein he was baptized, and their hands that ſtrooke him, and *Iudas* mouth that kiſſed him. And we muſt thereupon haue ſome commandement of God, to worſhip thoſe things which touched the body of our Lord.

Certainly if the body of our Lord by being touched, did ſanctifie inſenſible things, in ſuch manner as to make them worthy of worſhip, much more would he haue ſanctified thoſe, who bearing great loue vnto him had touched him. Why then would hee depriue *Marie Magdalen* of that grace, ſaying vnto her, *Touch me not, for I am not yet aſcended to my Father?* The Church of Rome doth not worſhip emptie Chalices, although they beleeue that the bloud of Chriſt hath bin therein. It doth not worſhip the Prieſt, when it beleeueth that he hath Ieſus Chriſt in his ſtomacke. And certainly after the death of a Prieſt, it is a wonder that his ſtomacke which was wont to be the ordinary receptacle of Ieſus Chriſt, is not layd vp among Relickes, and conſecrated for that touching.

Iob. 20. 17.

Touching the adoration of the Image of the Croſſe, we haue alreadie condemned it to be idolatrie, by all that which we formerly produced againſt adoration of Images. And if it be idolatry to worſhip the Image of a liuing thing, much more to worſhip the Image of a ſenſleſſe thing. And I would gladly know to whom they ſpeake, when in the Romiſh Church they ſay, *I ſalute thee, wood.* Do they ſpeake to Ieſus Chriſt?

Christ? Iesus Christ is not wood. Do they speak to the wood? That wood vnderstands them not. Do they speake to that wood in honour of Iesus Christ? That whereunto men speak in honour of Iesus Christ, ought to vnderstand what a man saith. No man (if he be not mad) doth speake to the wood of the kings chaire in honor of the king. But on the contrary, he were worthy to be bound with *Hippocrates* bands, that speaketh to a painted chaire, and doth reuerence thereunto. That is it which is done in the Romish Church, where they not onely speake to the Crosse, but also to the Image of the Crosse, adoring it.

To be short, we must alwayes haue recourse to the commandement of God, and to the prohibition to make any Image, nor the likenesse of things which are in heauen or in earth, nor to fall downe before them, nor to do any worship vnto them.

Touching this custome of carrying a piece of the wood of the true Crosse about men, note by the way, that the nature of false religions is to change vertues into outward shewes, and necessary piety into superfluous ceremonies: Also to obey the commandement of our Sauiour, who will haue vs to beare his Crosse: in the Church of Rome they beare a piece of wood hanging about their necks. They carry the Crosse hanging down vpon their bellies: but that belly is an enemy to the Crosse of Iesus Christ. But touching the true Crosse whereof Iesus Christ speaketh, which is affliction for the Gospell, the Church of Rome makes vs beare that, persecuting those which say the Crosse of Christ is our only satisfaction, our onely merit, and our onely propitiatory sacrifice.

Of Relickes, and of their worship.

Our difference is not, whether we must with honour keepe the relickes of Saints, or whether their sepulchers ought to be set in decent places, and their memories honourable. That 122. *Sect.*

is not questionable: for if with a commendable curiosity wee visit the Sepulchers of ancient Pagan Emperors, and persons of great fame, either for military vertues, or knowledge in good learning; and doing so, we are not blamed; how much more willingly would we see the tombes of the Apostles, and of those organs of the holy Ghost which yet speake now after they are dead? And if their sepulchers were in an vndecent place, or exposed to the contempt and disgrace of infidels, it were a godly duty and a good worke, to transport them into some more conuenient and sure place. If *Vigilantius* said, that the bones of Saints ought to be cast vpon dunghils; & if *Hierome* did truly and without passion report the opinió of that person, there is not one of vs but would abhorre those prophane words. It is true, that our aduersaries obiect against vs, that during the troubles and ciuill warres, we burnt the Saints relickes, and melted the shrines wherein their bodies lay: But if those relickes had bene true relickes, and worthy of reuerence, yet they do wrong to impute that to the religion which was done by the insolencie of certaine souldiers, whereof a great part were of the Romish Church; and serning those which first hired them, had authoritie among ours to haue part of the booty. They ought also to remember, that those things were done by the souldiers without warrant from the Church, to reuenge those massacres and burnings which were done vpon and against vs many yeers before we thought vpó our owne defence. It is a small matter to spoyle Churches, in respect of burning and massacring of the faithfull, which are the temple of God. And it is an hard & a difficult thing, when men are once entred into armes, to retaine and hold them that are prouoked to anger within the bounds of mediocrity. But the chiefe point is, that all those relickes which were in that manner dispersed, were of the same nature with those which are yet left, that is, false relicks of true Saints, or true relicks of false Saints, that liued not long since, & were beholding to the Pope for the title of Saints. Which if those that worshipped them had buried in perpetuall oblivion, they had thereby healed Christendome of a great wound,

wound, and had aboliſhed ſtrange ſuperſtition. Adde hereunto, that by the diſſipation of relickes obiected vnto vs, the number of relickes is rather increaſed then diminiſhed. For ſoone after they forged others in greater number, which being newer and leſſe vſed, ought to be of greater value, and haue more vertue.

Who is able to declare the enormity of this abuſe? In the Church of Rome they adore bones, old cloathes, milke, and haires: they ſpeake vnto thoſe relickes, they kiſſe them, they perfume them with incenſe, they offer vnto them, and they carry them about in proceſſion. When they ſhew them vnto the people, alwayes the baſon is hard by, whereinto euery one throwes a piece of money. The ſecond Councell of Nice holden *anno* 787. in the 4. Action, will haue *their bones, aſhes, and old cloathes worſhipped. Bellarmine* in the fourth Chap. of the booke of Relicks, groundeth the worſhipping of them vpon theſe words of *Chryſoſtome*, in his Sermon vpon *Inuentius*, and *Maximus*: *Tumulos martyrum adoramus*: Let vs adore *Martyrs* tombes: putting *adoremus* for *adornemus*, by an euident falſhood. Cardinal *Baronius* in his 9. tome, *an.* 821. ſaith, that Pope *Clement* the 8. ſent him to view and to worſhip the venerable body of *Cacile*. Without the quire of Saint *Pauls* Church in Paris on the left ſide, the miracles of Saint *Roc* are painted, with this inſcription, *That men are healed of a bile or a plague-ſore by adoring his precious body*. The Catechiſme of the Councell of Trent, in the expoſition of the third Commandement, approueth the cuſtome to ſweare by the relicks of Saints. Now to ſweare by any thing, is to take it for a witneſſe of the puritie of our conſcience, and for a reuenge in caſe of periury: which belongs onely vnto God, whoſe commandement in the ſixth of Deuteronomie is thus, *Thou ſhalt feare thy Lord the God, and ſhalt ſerue him, and ſweare by his name*. This was the forme and māner of an oath vſed in Iſrael, *The eternall liueth*, and, *As true as God liueth*, &, *I call God to witneſſe*. But they neuer ſware by the creature. It is a friuolous excuſe to ſay, that to ſweare by relicks, is to ſweare by God which hath ſanctified them: for by the ſame reaſon we may

Edit. Colon. p. 104 *Oſſa, cineres, pannos, ſanguinem, ſepulchra dexiq; martyrum adoramus.*

§ 14. *Me tanto licet munere indigniſſimum præmiſit explorare & adorare venerandum eorum corpus.*

may ſweare by the Sunne, and by heauen, and by the earth, and excuſe our ſelues and ſay, that wee vnderſtand by them God which created thoſe things. As alſo when they ſpeake to thoſe relicks, worſhipping them, they ſay things vnto the which are not agreeable vnto God. When they ſay, *God preſerue thee triumphant wood*, they ſpeake not to God, which is not wood. Or if men ſpeake to wood in honour of God, that thing whereunto one ſpeaketh in honour of God, muſt alwayes vnderſtand that which is ſpoken vnto it. The worſhip of relickes ought to be relatiue, ſo the greater part of our aduerſaries ſay. Then to adore relickes, is not to adore God, for we muſt adore God with abſolute adoration, and for the loue of himſelfe. So the prayer which they make to the Iron point of the ſpeare, is ſpoken in termes which are not agreeable with Ieſus Chriſt; for after they haue ſaid vnto it, *I ſalute thee triumphant Iron*, they ſay vnto it, *Wound vs with the loue of him whom thou didſt pierce.*

In hymno, Aue ferrum triumphale. Felix haſta nos amore, per te Exo ſaucia.

To theſe relicks the people go with ſuch feruent deſire, that the ſeruice of God is key-cold in reſpect of that. All the Angels together haue not the fourth part of the honour which the people of Paris giue to the ſhrines of Saint *Geneuiefue*, and Saint *Marcel*.

But if we looke neerer into theſe relickes, wee cannot but admire their ingredients, and the diuerſity of trinkets and toyes contained in them. The Cautels of the Maſſe ordaine, that if Mice haue eaten the body of our Lord, thoſe beaſts ſhall be taken and burnt, and their aſhes put into coffins or ſhrines for relickes. The ſame commandement is made touching the caſting vp of the Sacrament by a prieſt, or a ſicke perſon that ſhal haue caſt his god out of his belly. At Beauvais in Beauvoiſis, there is one of S. *Chriſtopher:* teeth, ſo great, that a dozen ſuch teeth will fill the mouth of an ouen. At Rome, in Saint Iohn de Latrans Church, they keepe the foreſkin of Ieſus Chriſt. In the Church which is in the Parke of wood at Vincennes, they haue ſome of the powder of Saint *Martins* cloake, and one of Ieſus Chriſts ſucking teeth. At Courchiuerny neere to Bloys, they keepe *Ioſephs* hemme at the

the ſound of his breathing when he hewed timber. Our pilgrimes from Galicia bring feathers of hennes that are of the race of that Cocke which crowed when Saint *Peter* denied Ieſus Chriſt. Cardinall *Baronius*, in the nine hundred and two and twentieth yeere of his Annales, maketh mention of a locke of the haire of Saint *Peters* beard which did miracles, *although* (ſaith he) *thoſe that do ſit in his Throne, ſeeke to ouerthrow it by euill manners.* And theſe reliques are kept ſo many ages and neuer corrupt. They ſay, that the virgin *Maries* Milke hath continued ſixteene hundred yeeres, and neuer was ſowre.

Quantumlibet ipſi qui ſupra eius ſedem ſedent, eam impugnent moribus praui.

In the meane time, we ſee the hoſts which are called Ieſus Chriſt, become mouldie in a few dayes, and the preſence of Ieſus Chriſt, which is life it ſelfe, cannot keepe the accidents of this rediculous corruption from mouldring; by the which they will haue the roundneſſe, the breadth, the whiteneſſe, and the ſofteneſſe, to mould and breed wormes; that is to ſay, that from accidents they ſhould turne into Subſtance. But not long ſince ſome reliques are become corrupt. For *Gregorie* of Tours, toward the end of his Hiſtorie ſaith, That hauing viſited the reliques in S. *Martins* Church in Tours, he found them to be very rotten, but many yeeres after they were all whole againe. The falſhood of theſe reliques appeareth, not onely by the abſurditie, but alſo in that they are contradicted by the truth of ancient Hiſtories, as alſo by our aduerſaries themſelues.

At Chartres they haue the virgin *Maries* ſmocke, which was brought from Conſtantinople into France by *Charles* the Bald, as they ſay that keepe it. And ſo ſaith *Fauchet* (from their reports) in the eleuenth booke of the Antiquities of France, chap. 7. But *Charles* the Bald was neuer in Conſtantinople: and in the virgin *Maries* time they wore no ſmockes, which was the reaſon they vſed ſo many baths to waſh the ſweate from their bodies.

The Councell of Conſtance, in the tenth Seſsion, ſaith that Saint *Iohns* head is in Saint *Siluſters* Monaſterie of Nunnes in Rome. But *Amiens* and *Arras* brag that they haue it: *Edit. Colon. pag. 817.*

and Saint Iohn d'Angeri hath long time bene famous for the ſame relique.

Who ſhall decide the controuerſie betweene Treues in Germanie, and Argentuell neere Paris, for both of them boaſt to haue the coate without ſeame which our Saniour Chriſt wore? *Baronius* in his Annales, *anno* 1052 produceth a Bull of Pope *Leo* the ninth; whereby he declareth that thoſe of Saint Denis by Paris miſtake themſelues, pretending that they haue the body of Saint *Denis Areopagita*; and ſaith, that the body of that Saint is whole in Ratisbone, to a very finger.

All men know, that in Saint Iohn Baptiſts time there were no altars in Iudea, but thoſe that were in the Temple of Ieruſalē: yet the booke of Romiſh Indulgences printed at Rome, ſaith, that S. *Iohn de Latran* was guardian of the altar whereon S. Iohn Baptiſt ſaid Seruice in the wilderneſſe.

§ 1. *Chriſti natalis nobiliſſimum monimentum in ligno confictum, nullâque argenti vel auri cælatura contectum poſt multa tempora inde tranſlatum, Roma poſſidet.*

Baronius in his Preface vpon his Annales, in 1. Tome, alledgeth a place of *Chryſoſtome* which ſaith, That the manger wherein Ieſus Chriſt was borne, was of earth: which he confuteth, becauſe that which is kept in Rome is made of wood.

Sigonius in the 7. booke of his Hiſtorie of Italie, ſaith, That at Genoa they keepe a Cup made of Emeralds, wherein our Lord Ieſus Chriſt celebrated the holy Supper. But *Baronius in anno* 34. of his Annales, §. 63. (following *Beda*) ſaith, That it was a ſiluer cup with two handles or eares, and that the Sponge is in the Chalice.

At Collen men go to worſhip the three Kings, which neuer were. They call them *Gaſper*, *Melchior*, and *Baltazar*: whereof the two firſt names are Dutch. This fable is conuicted to be falſe, by all the circumſtances of time, place, and the hiſtorie of Saint *Matthew*, as alſo by all antiquitie.

Diſt. 12. Can. Quis neſciat. Legant ſi in his prouincys vllus Apoſtolus inuenitur aut legitur docuiſſe, &c.

Spaine boaſteth, that at Compoſtella in Galicia they haue the body of S. *Iames* the Apoſtle, brother of our Lord, which they ſay died there after he had conuerted *Lupa* Queen of Spaine, and planted Chriſtianity in Spaine. But Pope *Innocent* the firſt denieth that any other Apoſtle beſides Saint *Peter* did teach the Goſpell in France or in Spaine. And the truth

truth is, that then there was neither King nor Queene in Spaine, it being at that time wholly vnder the dominion of the Romane Empire. And S. *Iames* death which happened not long after the death of Christ, Acts 12. gaue him not time nor leisure to make so long voyages. From this Saint *Iames* in Galicia Pilgrims bring Scallop shels, as from Saint *Claude* they bring Whistles; and from Rome holy graines. It is good vpon this subiect to heare what * *Vasques* the Iesuite his third booke of Adoration, saith: his words are these: *As touching this, that sometimes among reliques some are vncertaine, that hindereth vs not from worshipping those reuerently, which we hold to be certaine by coniectures and humane reasons. To be short, euen as in the first Disputation, c. sp. 3. we haue said, that it is no sinne of Idolatrie to worship a beame of the light vnder the which the diuell hides himselfe when any one thinketh it to be Christ: so when any one thinketh that that is a part or member of a Saint which is not, yet neuertheless he loseth not the merit of his deuotion.*

* *Disp. 3. cap. 8. §. 314. Quod verò apud aliquos incertè aliquando reliquiæ sint, non obest quo minus eas quas humanis coniecturis & rationibus certas habemus reuerenter colere debeamus. Denique sicut in prima disputatione cap. 3. diximus, non esse peccatum Idolatriæ, adorare radium luminis sub quo dæmon delitescat, quando quis putat esse Christum. Eodem modo si quis putans aliquam esse particulam Sancti quæ re vera non est, meritò suæ deuotionis non cauet.*

George Cassander in his Consultation, in the chapter of the worshipping of reliques, after he hath said, that in times past when the memorie of Martyrs was fresh and their reliques certaine, miracles were done at their sepulchers, but abuse hath crept in: That in the times of *Basil*, *Ambrose*, and *Augustine*, assemblies made in memorie of Martyrs were changed into Faires, and into feasts, where the people dranke themselues drunke: That to inueigle the people, men haue supposed false reliques, and false miracles: and that oftentimes by diabolicall illusions, superstitious persons haue bene abused: That trauellers, for profit and gaine haue made marchandise of false reliques: That the custome to lay the bodies of Saints vnder the Altar is changed, and that now they lay them vpon the Altar. At last he addeth these words, saying, * *At this day, when euery place seemeth to be full of*

* *Hodie verò cum passim omnia reliquiis sanctorum plena videntur, verendum est ne si Episcopi & Principes in veris reliquiis inquirendis & diiudicandis eam quam debent operam adhiberent, ingentes & detestandæ impostvræ patefierent, quemadmodum in nonnullis locis factum est, vt olim S. Martino accidit, &c.*

Reliques of Saints, it is to be feared that if Bishops and Princes would take that paines that they should do, to search for and to examine which are true reliques, great and detestable impostures would be found, as it hath happened in some places: and as heretofore it happened to Saint Martine, who going to a place of his Diocesse, famous because of the sepulcher of one whom they reported to be a martyr, found that the people reuerenced and came, not to the sepulcher of a Martyr, but of a wicked thiefe, which he presently caused to be razed and pulled downe to the ground. This testimonie out of the mouth of one of our aduersaries is verie considerable.

Confutation of this worship of Reliques by the Word of God.

123. Sect. Besides the places of Scripture produced in the precedent Sections, whereby we are forbidden to giue any worship, or to do any religious service to any other but onely vnto God, there are particular places against the worshipping of Reliques.

1 In the old Testament we see that the bodies of the holie Patriarches and Prophets were buried, and put in the sepulchers of their fathers. *Ioseph* dying, ordained that his bones should be kept vntill the people went out of Ægypt, Genesis 50. 25.

2 *Moses* being dead, God would not let the Israelites know the place where he was buried, lest they should haue abused it to Idolatrie.

3 In the 2. and 23. of Kings, King. *Iosias* forbad the people to take vp the bodie of a dead Prophet out of the earth, and willed them to let it lie where it was buried. He made no transportation of his bones, nor did no worship, no seruice, no offering nor adoration thereunto. The like is said in generall of all the bodies of the Saints, as of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Iacob*, *Samuel*, and *Dauid*, whose bones haue not bene remo-

remoued, worshipped, nor separated one from the other, that diuers townes might haue their parts thereof. S. *Peter* in the 2. Chap. and 29. verse of the Acts, witnesseth that then in his time *Dauids* sepulcher was to be seene, whose bones were not remoued from thence.

4 In the 2. of Kings 13.21. verse, God raised a dead man by touching the dead body of the Prophet *Elisæus*: God by that miracle authorising the authoritie of that Prophets doctrine. Yet for all that it is not found that his body was taken out of his graue, nor laid vpon an altar, nor that the people fell downe before his bones, nor that they brought offerings vnto them, nor that they kissed them, nor carried them about in procession.

5 If any man thinketh that the bodies of the Saints vnder the old Testament were pollured, or lesse holy then the bodies of the faithfull in these times, he is confuted by this example: for if euer any sepulcher of a Saint may be said to haue bene sanctified by God, it was that of *Elisæus*, at the which God shewed forth so admirable vertue. Then the death of the iust was precious before God, as it is said, Psalme 116. And our aduersaries themselues do sufficiently shew that they esteem the bones of the Saints vnder the old Testament, no lesse holy then others, seeing they haue some of them yet among their pretended reliques. And at the vtmost this euasion can serue but for the bones of the Patriarches and Prophets, and not for their apparell and moueables, which then were not kept in shrines, as at this day they keepe small rags and torne coates and shirts of the Apostles and other Saints.

6 The Prophet Esay 14. and Ieremie 22. 19. among the threatnings and curses of God, make want of buriall one. Then how is that which God placeth among his curses, at this day turned into an honour? Why do men take the Saints bones out of the places where they rest? Why are they laid open to the sight of men? Why are they separated and carried to diuers places?

7 And to come to the new Testament, Acts 8. certaine men fearing God, laid the body of Saint *Steuen* which was

ſtoned into the ground, but worſhipped not his body, nor diſmembred it not, to ſeparate his bones into diuers places.

8 In the 19. of the Acts many were healed by touching the kercher and linnen cloathes that came from Saint *Pauls* body: yet thoſe linnen clothes were not put into a ſhrine, nor any worſhip done vnto them. Theſe miracles were not done to cauſe them to adore thoſe clothes, but to authoriſe the preaching of the Apoſtle.

9 The Prophet Eſay 8. 19, 20. after he had reproued diuiners and inchanters which went to the dead to aske counſell for men that liued, ſaith not vnto them, *Why do you not rather go to the relickes of Saints that are dead*, but ſends them to the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they would be illuminated by the true light.

10 And to be ſhort, touching this worſhipping of Relicks, when our aduerſaries are preſſed to produce one onely place of the word of God for it, they are at a ſtay, and ſay nothing. And if they produce any thing, it is rather to mocke God then to inſtruct men. *Bellarmine* in the fourth chapter of his booke of Relickes, falſly and againſt all truth, ſaith, that the holy Scripture approueth the worſhipping or religious ſeruice done and vſed to the Sepulcher of our Lord, to the skirts of his gowne, to the ſhadow of Saint *Peter*, and to S. *Pauls* kercher. A wiſe man cannot affirme this, vnleſſe he ſpeake againſt his owne conſcience: for he knoweth, that in the Scripture there is not one word ſpoken of religious ſeruice done to thoſe things. And it is a wonder, ſeeing among the relickes which are worſhipped, he placeth Saint *Peters* ſhadow, that the Church of Rome doth not keepe ſome pieces of that ſhadow, as well as of the blowing and breathing of *Ioſeph*.

5. *Ad tertium Scriptura approbat cultum ſepulchri & fimbriæ Chriſti: Item vmbra Petri, ſudariorum & ſemicinctiorum Pauli.*

The ſame Cardinall in the beginning of the third chapter, falſly alledgeth Eſay 11. 10. in theſe words, *His ſepulcher ſhall be glorious*: but according to the Hebrew, it is, *And his reſt ſhall be glorious*. Furthermore a ſepulcher may be honored without religious worſhip.

In the meane time, let the indifferent Reader conſider what

what religion that may be, which hideth the writings of the Apoſtles from the people, and ſhewes them their bones; which burieth their doctrine, and vnburieth their bones. As if a ſonne ſhould carefully keepe old bootes, or a piece of his fathers skull, and hide away his Teſtament. The beſt relickes of Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul* are their writings diuinely inſpired. That which onely ſhould be cheriſhed and ſought for, is the onely thing which is neglected: as the Iewes did, who beautified the ſepulchers of the Prophets, and perſecuted thoſe which followed their doctrine. Wherein marke the policie. For they ſeeke for and worſhip the bones of the Apoſtles in ſtead of ſeeking for their writings, becauſe thoſe bones ſpeake not, but their wiritings ſpeake, and ſay things that are odious vnto the Papiſts: as alſo becauſe in ſtead of thoſe bones they can haue others, but they cannot make another holy Scripture. And becauſe it is not ſo eaſie for them to trafficke with places of Scripture, as with pieces of relickes, whereof they onely ſell the ſight, and make a trafficke of merchandiſe, and neuer deliuer it.

THE XXIX. ARTICLE.

As touching the true Church, we beleeue that it ought to be gouerned according to the politicke order which our Sauiour Chriſt eſtabliſhed: That is, That there ſhould be Paſtors and Deacons, to the end that the purity of doctrine may haue his courſe, that vices may be corrected and repreſſed, and that the poore & all others which are afflicted, may be ſuccoured in their neceſſities, and that their aſſemblies may be made in the name of God, wherein great and ſmall may be edified.

The aduerſary paſſeth ouer this Article, and ſaith nothing to it.

THE XXX. ARTICLE.

Of the Rule and dominion of the Prelates of the Church of Rome.

We beleeue, that all true Paſtors, in what place ſoeuer they be, haue the ſame authority and equall power, vnder one and the ſame head Ieſus Chriſt; and for that cauſe that no Church ought to pretend any dominion or ſeigniorie ouer others.

ARNOVX.

124. Sect. *This Article introduceth Anarchie, diuiſion, diſobedience, and diſorder into the houſe of God, and ouerthroweth the manner to gouerne eſtabliſhed by diuine Law in S. Mathew 16. and S. Iohn 20: by contempt of vnion, and ſubordination, which cannot be without ſome viſible head, ſuch an one as by theſe words is promiſed, There ſhall be one ſheepfold and one ſhepheard.*

MOVLIN.

Experience confuteth this accuſation. The Churches of France which preſented this Confeſsion to King *Francis* the ſecond, haue liued and do liue peaceably and without confuſion vnder this gouernement. This order, becauſe it is not a Monarchie, is not therefore an Anarchie, ſeeing that each Paſtor gouerneth his flocke, and that the Paſtors are ſubiect to a Synod, and the Synod is guided by one Moderator.

It is falſe that equality ouerthroweth the forme of gouernement eſtabliſhed in Matth. 16. and Iohn 20. for in thoſe places there is nothing ſpoken of ſuperiority or of ſubordination. Thſe are the ordinarie falſhoods of this Doctor.

Whereas he ſaith, that a viſible head of the Church is promiſed

miſed by theſe words, *There ſhal be one ſhepheard and one ſheepfold*: he doth it rather to mocke the Scripture, then to ſerue his turne therewith. This onely Paſtor is not the Pope, but Ieſus Chriſt. This ſheepfold gathered together vnder one Paſtor, is not the Church of Rome, but the Chriſtian Church compoſed of Iewes and Gentiles.

And we muſt know, that the equality of Paſtors touching the preaching of the word of God and the adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and as concerning the vſe of the keyes, is eſteemed to be neceſſary among vs. For Baptiſme, & the holy Supper, and the pronouncing of the remiſſion of ſins, are of equall dignity in the mouth of all Paſtors, whether they be of great or ſmall authority. But as touching Eccleſiaſticall policy, we do not refuſe to acknowledge thoſe for pure and true Churches, where this equalitie is not obſerued: becauſe we eſteeme not this order to be a point of faith, nor a doctrine tending to ſaluation. We liue (God be thanked) in brotherly concord with the neighbour Churches which obſerue another forme, and where Biſhops haue ſome ſuperioritie.

I know, that vnder pretence that the Church of England hath another forme of diſcipline then ours is, our aduerſaries charge vs that our religion is diuerſe. But experience confuteth this accuſation; for we aſſemble with the Engliſh mē in their Churches, we participate together in the holy Supper of our Lord: the doctrine of their Confeſsion is wholly agreeable vnto ours. England hath bene a refuge for our perſecuted Churches, who, notwithſtanding the difference of Eccleſiaſticall policie, haue not receiued leſſe entertainement. The excellenteſt ſeruants of God in our Churches, as *Peter Martyr*, *Caluin*, *Zanchius*, and *Beza*, haue often written letters full of reſpect and amitie to the Prelates of England.

He abuſeth himſelfe, which beleeueth that the word *Biſhop* vſed in the holy Scripture, is odious in our Churches. And our Aduerſaries vniuſtly accuſe vs to be enemies of the Epiſcopall order. For we muſt be altogether ignorant in Hiſtories, if we do not know that all antiquitie ſpeakes honorably of that degree. *Euſebius* in his Chronicle witneſſeth that

a yeere after our Sauiours death, *Iames* our Lords brother was eſtabliſhed Biſhop of Ieruſalem, and that 10. yeeres after, *Enodius* was created Biſhop of Antiochia; and that after *Iames*, ſucceeded *Simon* in the biſhopricke of Ieruſalem, from whence deſcended the ſucceſſion of the Biſhops of Ieruſalem. Saint *Hierome* in his booke of Eccleſiaſticall Writers ſaith, that *Polycarpus* (Saint *Iohn* the Apoſtles diſciple) was by the ſame Apoſtle made Biſhop of Smyrna. In the ſame booke he ſaith, that the Apoſtle Saint Paul eſtabliſhed *Timothy* Biſhop of Epheſus, and *Titus* Biſhop of Candie. And *Tertullian* in the 32. chapter of the booke of Præſcriptions, calleth thoſe Churches, Apoſtolicall Churches; and buds or ſprigs of the Apoſtles, whoſe Biſhops were eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtles. Of this function and degree in the Church were the Fathers, whoſe writings we haue, as *Gregorie Nazianzen*, *Gregorie Niſſen*, *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Cyprian*, *Auguſtine*, *Hilarie*, &c. Of whom whoſoeuer doubteth that they had not ſome ſuperioritie, and that to them particularly gouernement of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes did not appertaine, hath no knowledge of Antiquitie.

It is hard in all Antiquitie to find three or foure examples of two Biſhops in one towne; for generall cuſtome was againſt it, which permitted not two Biſhops to be together in one towne: as *Theodoret*, *Chryſoſtome*, and *Hierome* vpon the firſt chapter to the Philippians witneſſe, and *Auguſtine* in his 110. Epiſtle.

These examples are found in my booke of the Vocation of Paſtors, l. 1. c. 4.

But becauſe we haue no expreſſe commandement for this ſuperioritie in the new teſtament: and for that, as experience hath ſhewed it hath bene as a match to kindle pride, and hath degenerated into Papall tyranny; as alſo becauſe the Church of Rome hath changed her biſhopricke into a temporall Principalitie, and hath made Epiſcopall dignitie ſubiect to the power of the Pope, to whom for many yeeres paſt, euery Biſhop at his admiſſion tooke an oath of obedience and fidelitie; for theſe cauſes, the faithfull ſeruãts of God, which haue trauelled and taken paines to aboliſh and to purge Papiſtry in France, in the Netherlands, and in Switzerland, haue ſought

to

to reduce the ſacred Miniſtery into the Church, and to aboliſh the Papal Hierarchie. But in England, where God hath vſed Biſhops to ſtriue againſt and to reſiſt Papiſtry, & where God hath giuen them ſoueraigne Princes, which maintained and vpheld them by their power, Epiſcopall order continueth, and flouriſheth at this day. And God hath here raiſed vp and ſtill doth, excellent Biſhops, both for learning and pietie, which courageouſly maintaine Gods cauſe, both by word of mouth and writing: and ſome of them alſo haue receiued the crowne of martyrdome for the confeſsion of the Goſpell.

And euen as equalitie is receiued among vs to ſhunne ambition and tyrannie, ſo England hath reiected this equalitie, to auoyd confuſion and contempt of the Miniſterie. They ſay, and that with good reaſon, that no ſocietie, no familie nor common-wealth, can proſper without ſome degrees of ſuperioritie: and that it is ſo among the Angels, and in the gouernment of the vniuerſall world. That God eſtabliſhed degrees of ſuperiority in his Church vnder the old Teſtament. They ſay, that to place a man of little capacitie, and newly receiued into the Miniſterie, in like degree with an ancient Miniſter of the Church, whom God hath endowed with more gifts, and which hath ſerued long time in the Miniſterie with commendation, is a meanes to nouriſh pride in the yonger, and to diſhonour thoſe whon God hath honoured, and to induce confuſion: as alſo that thereby the Miniſterie among vs is become contemptible. And that the ſuperiority of the Biſhops of England hath bene approued by the moſt worthy paſtors of our Churches, namely, *Peter Martyr* and *Bucer*, expreſly called into England to help them in their reformation.

All theſe allegations tend to three ends: one is, to ſhew that notwithſtanding the diuerſitie of Eccleſiaſticall policie, two particular Churches may liue in peace and concord, and vnder the band of one ſelfeſame faith & religion. The ſecond is, to ſhew that if ſometimes we ſpeake againſt the authoritie of Biſhops, we condemne not Epiſcopall order in it ſelfe,

but

but ſpeake onely of the corruption which the Church of Rome hath induced into the Biſhopricke, making it a temporall principalitie, depending vpon the Papall Throne. The third is to ſhew, that there ſhall neuer be any forme of diſcipline which hath not ſome dangers euitable in it, and which hath not ſome diſcommodities. That therefore is the beſt, which approcheth neereſt to the ſimplicitie of the Apoſtles and the diſcipline of their times, and which in ſuch ſort ſhunneth ambition, that thereby order may be maintained, and the dignitie of the Miniſterie no way contemned.

ARGVM.

125. Sect. *Places of Scripture noted in the Margent of the Confeſſion,* 2. Cor. 1, 14. *Not that we haue dominion ouer your faith, but we are helpers of your ioy.* Matth. 18. 2, 3, 4. *Ieſus hauing called vnto him a little child, and ſet him in the middeſt of them, ſaid, Verily I ſay vnto you, Except you be conuerted, and become as little children, you ſhall not enter into the kingdome of heauen. Whoſoeuer therefore ſhall humble himſelfe as this little child, the ſame is the greateſt in the kingdome of heauen.* And 20. 26. *But it ſhall not be ſo among you, but whoſoeuer will be great among you, let him be your ſeruant.* And 1. Peter 5. 3. *Not as though ye were Lords ouer Gods heritage, but that you may be examples to the flocke. All theſe places recommend humilitie in thoſe which are called to Eccleſiaſticall functions.*

MOVLIN.

That is true; but by recommending humilitie, he bindeth vs to ſhunne all occaſions of pride, and by conſequence, Lordly dominion and rule ouer our brethren.

To thoſes places we muſt adde theſe, Matth. 23. 8. *But be you not called Rabbi, for one is your Doctor, to wit, Chriſt, and ye are brethren.* And Luke 22. 24, 25, 26. *And there aroſe alſo a ſtriſe among them, which of them ſhould ſeeme to be the greateſt. But he ſaid vnto them, The Kings of the Gentiles reigne ouer them, and*

and they that rule ouer them are called Bountifull. But ye ſhall not be ſo, but let the greateſt among you be as the leaſt, and the chiefeſt as he that ſerueth.

ARNOVX.

126. Sect. *Theſe places (as it appeareth by the onely reading of them) preſuppoſe a ſuperioritie, which wanting, ſuch aduices ſhould be giuen in vaine.*

MOVLIN.

Thoſe aduices which forbid the affectation of ſuperiority, do not neceſſarily preſuppoſe that there is a ſuperioritie. By the ſame reaſon prohibitions to commit adulterie, ſhould preſuppoſe that neceſſarily there muſt be adulterers.

ARNOVX.

127. Sect. *Contrary places of Scripture. Matth 13. 11. Our Lord ſpeaking to his Apoſtles the true Paſtors, ſaid, He that is greateſt among you, let him be your ſeruant.*

MOVLIN.

This place is falſly quoted, there is no ſuch thing in the 11. verſe of the 13. chapter of Matthew. It is a place taken out of the 20. of Matth. v. 25, 26. but ſet downe in other termes. This is the place truly cited: *Ye know that the Lords of the Gentiles haue dominion ouer them, and they that are great, exerciſe authoritie ouer them: but it ſhall not be ſo among you. But whoſoeuer will be great among you, let him be your miniſter: and whoſoeuer will be chiefe among you, let him be your ſeruant.*

He that alledgeth things vpon other mens report, is ſubiect to fall into ſuch faults. But let vs ſee what he will inferre vpon this place.

ARNOVX.

128. Sect. *Do you not ſee, that theſe two things are not vnlike? To be the greateſt of all by reaſon of the charge which authoriſeth the commandement, and yet ſeruant vnto all, in regard of humilitie and charitie,*

tie, whereby he that hath that charge, not preferring himselfe in his heart before any man, doth sacrifice himselfe for the good and welfare of those which are committed to his charge.

MOVLIN.

Saint Matthew saith not, *He that is the greatest*, as *M. Arnoux* maketh him say, but, *Whosoeuer will be the greatest*. And if it were, *He that is the greatest*, that may be vnderstood of him which is the greatest in knowledge, or in age, or in order of sitting, without superioritie of iurisdiction.

I confesse, that greatnesse and humilitie agree very well; he that hath attained to soueraigne greatnesse, hath no other meanes to increase the same but by humilitie: for that his humilitie is so much the more commendable, because he hath more temptations to pride. But his humilitie must not be ambitious, seeking by contempt of honour, to make himselfe more honorable. Such is the Popes humilitie, which washeth poore mens feete, and makes Emperours kisse his feete: which calleth himselfe seruant of seruants, and makes himselfe King of Kings, giuing and taking away kingdomes: Which calles himselfe Christs Vicar, and sets Christs Crosse vpon his pantofle: Which falleth downe before the host, and makes it to be carried about in procession vpon a little nag or curtall horse, whereas himselfe is carried vpon Princes shoulders. If that be called humilitie, a man can hardly tell what pride is. But to imitate *M. Arnoux* eloquence, I aske if the Pope behauing himselfe in that manner, doth sacrifice himselfe for the welfare of those which are committed to his charge? doth not our Doctor with his childish eloquence rather sacrifice himselfe to the publike laughter of all men?

Of Saint Peters Supremacie.

ARNOVX.

129. Sect. *And Matthew* 10.2. *Now the names of the twelue Apostles are these:*

those: The first, Simon called Peter. Could he more formally speake against the Article which establisheth equalitie?

MOVLIN.

Saint *Peter* might be the first in age, or in zeale, or in knowledge, or in eloquence, or in vertue, or in prioritie of order & precedence, without power of iurisdiction ouer the rest of the Apostles. We reiect not this inequalitie, and our Article saith nothing against it.

Now, that Saint *Peter* had no superioritie nor power of iurisdiction ouer the other Apostles, neither was head of the vniuersall Church, the Scripture sheweth it so clearely, that he that denies it, must striue against his owne eyes, and belie his owne sense and reason.

1 We haue two Epistles written by Saint *Peter*, wherein there is not one word which soundeth or sauoureth of his soueraigntie. His manner of phrase therein is not the phrase of a master or of a superiour. He giueth himselfe no other title, but an Apostle of Iesus Christ, and an Elder. Doth a Soueraigne write long Letters to his Subiects, without once shewing himselfe to be a Soueraigne, without taking any quality of a Prince vpon him, or without any command?

2 And when the Apostles stroue among themselues about the Supremacie the day before Christs passion, the Lord said not vnto them, Why do you dispute about Superioritie, seeing you may remember that I haue already giuen the Supremacie to Saint *Peter*? but he onely said vnto them; *The Kings of the Gentiles reigne ouer them, but it shall not be so among you*, Luke 22. Then was the time or neuer to command the Apostles euery one to keepe in his order, and not to disturbe Saint *Peter* in his Supremacie. But in the 23. of Saint Matthew he saith, *But be you not called Rabbi, for one is your Doctor, to wit, Christ, and ye are brethren.*

3 In Acts 8. the Apostles sent *Peter* and *Iohn* to preach in Samaria. Would the Pope at this day take such a commission? would he subiect himselfe to other Bishops that should send him to preach in Swizzerland or in Poland?

4 How

4 How many times in the Scripture are the other Apostles set before *Peter*? as in 2. Galatians, *Iames*, *Cephas* and *Iohn*, *which are esteemed pillers*. And also Saint Iohn 1. 44. putteth *Andrew* before *Peter*, saying, *Philip was of Bethsaida the Citie of Andrew and Peter*. And 1. Cor. 9. 5. *The Lords brethren and Cephas*: a manner of speaking which at this day would be hardly taken, if we should put the Bishop of Paris before the Pope of Rome.

5 And 1. Cor. 3. 4. it is said, that among the Corinthians some said, *I am of Paul; another, I am of Apollos; others, I am of Peter*. An euident proofe, that neither *Paul* nor *Apollos* had taught the Corinthians to acknowledge *Peter* to be the head of the vniuersall Church. For those that said, I am *Pauls*, without doubt would haue beleeued *Paul*, and by consequence would haue aknowledged *Peter* for head and superior to *Paul*. For *Paul* would haue taught them to honour *Peter* more then himselfe.

6 Which appeareth by the reproofe which *Paul* gaue them thereupon. For he said not, Why do you say that Iam of *Paul* rather then of *Peter*, seeing that *Paul* told you that he was subiect to *Peter*? But he sends them to Iesus Christ the only head of the Church, saying, *Is Christ diuided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?*

7 The same Apostle, 2. Cor. 11. 5. saith, verily *I suppose that I was in nothing inferior to the very chiefe Apostles*. Saying *in nothing*, he excepteth nothing, to the end that men should not say, that Saint *Paul* vnderstood onely that he was not lesse then S. *Peter* in doctrine, or in the charge of preaching the Word, or administring of the Sacraments. Therefore Saint *Hierome* in his Commentary vpon the second to the Galatians, bringeth in Saint *Paul* comparing himselfe in this sort with Saint *Peter*; *I am nothing inferior vnto him, for we are established in the ministerie by one and the same God*.

In nullo sum illo inferior, quia ab vno Deo sumus in ministerio ordinati.

8 Saint *Paul* in Gal. 2. 6. saith, *For they that are the chiefe, did adde nothing vnto me*. Saint *Peter* therefore gaue not power to Saint *Paul*, nor conferred any authoritie vpon him.

9 The same Saint *Paul* saith; *That the preaching of the Gos-*

pell

pell of the vncircumcision was committed vnto him, as the Gospell of circumcision was committed to Peter. Therefore those two Apostles parting that labour betweene them, the one preached to the Iewes, the other to the Gentles. It would be a notable example, and worthy of Apostolicall humility, if a Bishop would diuide halfe the charge with the Pope. And yet the charge that fell to Saint *Paul*, was of more importance. For what comparison was there between a handful of Iewes committed to Saint *Peters* charge, with all the rest of the world? Which by the way sheweth, that Saint *Peter* did not reside in Rome, for then the Iewes were banished frō thence, as Saint *Luke* witnesseth, Acts 18.2. And Saint *Peter* would not haue chosen a towne to reside in, and to preach to the Iewes, where there were no Iewes.

10 And a little after in the ninth verse the Apostle saith, *That Iames, and Peter, and Iohn, which are accounted to be pillars, gaue him and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship*, that is, they receiued them for companions. Is there any Prelate at this day that dares call the Pope his companion? Note also, that *Peter* is not onely named after *Iames*, but also that *Iames* and *Iohn* are esteemed pillars of the Church as well as Saint *Peter*. As also in the Councell of Ephesus there is an Epistle of the Councell of Alexandria inserted, which saith, that *Peter* and *Iohn* are of equall dignity one as the other.

THE XXXI. ARTICLE.

Of the vocation of Pastors.

We beleeue that no man of his owne authoritie ought to thrust himselfe into the gouernment of the Church: but that it ought to be done by election, if it be possible, & that God will permit it. Which exception we adde specially, because it hath sometimes fal-

len out, and that in our time (wherein the ſtate of the Church was corrupted) that God raiſed vp men by extraordinary meanes, to erect the Church againe which was fallen into ruine and deſolation. But howſoeuer it be, we beleeue, that we muſt alwayes be conformable to this rule; that all Paſtors, Ouerſeers, and Deacons, ought to haue teſtimony that they are called to their offices.

ARNOVX.

130. Sect. *This is the Article, whereby they take vpon them the reformation of the Church which was loſt and deſolate, without producing any promiſes or Prophecies of ſo notable and generall reformation in all capitall matters of Beliefe, nor any witneſſe of their extraordinary authority, nor any miracles which make them acceptable as in times paſt Ieſus Chriſt and Moſes in the like occaſions ſhewed, nor any ſucceſſion or dependance whereby they haue ordinary commiſſion.*

MOVLIN.

For the vnderſtanding of this Article, you muſt conſider, that it is the Churches of France which ſpeake, and that by conſequence, by reſtoring of the Church, we onely vnderſtand the reeſtabliſhment & reformation which God in our time hath brought to paſſe in France, and not what hath been done in the vniuerſall Church: therefore the aduerſary hath no reaſon to require prophecies of vs which promiſe ſo notable reformation. For the holy Scripture ſpeaketh not of France, nor of any accidents that ſhould happen therein. To be aſſured of a thing, it is ſufficiet to ſee it, although we cannot ſhew that God foreſhewd it. If we muſt beleeue nothing that hath hapned in our age, vnleſſe wee can ſhew that God foreſhewed it by prophecie, we muſt not beleeue that the Pope in our time hath depoſed our Kings, and moued the French-men to rebellion. We muſt not beleeue the inſpirations of the mother *Tereſe*, nor the miracles of Saint *Iohn de-*

la Croix, nor the comming of the Iesuites. It is true that the Reuelation foreſheweth the maſſacres and perſecutions of the faithfull: and that the whore clothed in ſcarlet, ſitting in the towne which hath ſeuen hils, ſhall make Kings drunke: the Apoſtle alſo foreſheweth, that the ſonne of perditiō ſhall call himſelfe God, and ſhall boaſt of miracles: and that falſe Doctors ſhall come, which ſhould teach abſtinence from marriage and from meates. And the holy Spirit foreſheweth vnto vs, that God will raiſe vp a few faithfull witnes, which ſhall preach with great affliction, in ſpirituall Sodom, vntill ſuch time as the beaſt ſhall kill them. But theſe predictions are not for the Churches of France onely, which in this Article ſpeake of that which is particular vnto them.

Touching the vocation of faithfull Paſtors, which God hath extraordinarily raiſed in our times to fight againſt Papiſtrie, the clearing of this matter dependeth vpon knowing what the vocation of the Paſtors of the Church of Rome is. Wherein there are two ſorts of vocations of Paſtors, whereof the one is none, the other corrupted. The vocation of Popes, terming themſelues heads of the vniuerſall Church, and the vocation of Cardinals, are no vocations, as being humane conſtitutions contrary to the Word of God. And the vocation of Biſhops and Prieſts therein is corrupted. According to the word of God, their charge is to preach the Word, to adminiſter the Sacraments, and to gouerne their flockes. But the Prieſts charge is changed into the office of a ſacrificer of the body of Chriſt, & the charge of a Biſhop, is the charge of a Prince of the Popes temporall monarchie, as appeareth by the oath which Biſhops make at their admiſſion, which is inſerted into the *Romane Pontificall, wherein there is no mention made either of God or of his Word, but it is an oath which a ſubiect maketh to his ſoueraigne, or a vaſſall to his feodarie Lord. Among this corruption, this good onely remaineth, that when the Biſhop admitteth a Prieſt, he sheweth him his dutie, and the nature of his charge, ſaying, ** The Prieſt muſt bleſſe, he muſt gouerne, he muſt preach,

* The Reader may ſee this oath at the end of my booke of the Vocation of Paſtors.

** *Sacerdotem oportet benedicere, præeſſe, prædicare, & baptizare.*

preach, and he must baptize. And a little after, *** Let your doctrine be a spirituall medicine to the people of God: let the sauour of your life be a reioycing to Christs Church, that by preaching and good examples you may build vp the house of God.

*** Sit doctrina vestra spiritualis medicina populo Dei. Sit odor vitæ vestræ delectamentum Ecclesiæ Christi, vt prædicatione atque exemplo ædificetis domum Dei.

The same obligatory words to teach the pure doctrine of the Gospell, are spoken to the Bishop: Where the consecrator asketh the future Bishop, saying, We aske thee, whether thou wilt employ thy wisdome, as much as thy capacity serueth thee, to the sence of the holy Scripture? And after that, * Wilt thou both by words and examples teach the people ouer whom thou art established, that which thou vnderstandest out of the diuine Scriptures? Whereunto the future Bishop maketh answer, and saith, *Volo*, I will. Then laying downe the Bible before him, he saith vnto him, ** Receiue the Gospell, & preach vnto the people committed to thy charge.

* Vis ea quæ ex diuinis scripturis intelligis plebem cui ordinandus es, & verbis docere & exemplis? Volo.

** Accipe Euangelia, & vade & prædica populo tibi commisso.

These are ancient things, remaining entire among horrible corruptiõs, to the end that they may serue to touch the consciences of those that should take that charge vpon them, and that that good which remaineth, may serue to correct or to condemne that which is euill. Now it so fell out in our fathers times, that certaine persons called to the charge and offices of Priests, Doctors, & Bishops, hauing by the Word of God knowne and found out the abuse of the Papacy, sought to accomplish their oathes, and called to remembrãce the nature of the charge wherin they were established, and in the same seates began to change their speech, and to preach the truth. They made vse of that good which was left in that corrupted function; God intending in that reformatiõ to employ those which had the vsual charges receiued in the Churches of their Countries, to the end that they might be the better receiued and esteemed of by the people, and that their vocatiõ might not be denied or controuerted. For if the Church of Rome hath no lawfull vocation, why doth she require that in another which she her selfe hath not? If she hath lawfull vocation, then those without question had the same vocation. And it is in this, all one as if in the Arian

or

or Neſtorian Churches, a Paſtor hauing acknowledged his error, ſhould take vpon him to confute Arianiſme, and to preach the true faith; and that therefore the ſaid heretickes ſhould moleſt him and aske him, ſaying, Where is thy vocation, and where are thy miracles to authorize thee? That is in effect as if they ſhould ſay vnto him, Who gaue thee charge to keepe thy oath, which thou madeſt at thy admiſſion? And where is the vocation which authorizeth thee to be faithfull vnto God?

Hereupon they aske vs, whether thoſe faithfull Paſtors, who in our fathers times put their helping hands to reformation, had ordinary or extraordinary vocation? The anſwer is, that they had that vocation which was ordinary, & vſuall in the Church in their Countries. But becauſe the doctrine and the vocation of their Church was corrupted, beſides that ordinary vocation, they had an extraordinary commiſſion. For touching the ordinary and vſuall charge in the Church in their countries, they retained that which therein was good, that is, their duties to preach, and purely to adminiſter the Sacraments. But they had this extraordinary, that God employed them to preach contrary to their intentions which ordained them, as being contrary to the intention of Ieſus Chriſt the firſt author of that vocation. And this extraordinary commiſſion being well conſidered, is no other thing but the ancient ordinary charge. It is inueterate corruption which cauſeth their enterpriſe to ſeeme extraordinary, as health ſeemeth to be new, after a long diſeaſe or ſickneſſe of body.

We muſt not thinke it ſtrange, that a man hauing an ordinary vocation, ſhould by God be employed in an extraordinary work. The holy Scripture furniſheth vs with many examples thereof. *Ieremy*, *Ezechiel*, and *Iohn Baptiſt* were Leuites and Prieſts, hauing ordinary charge in the Church; and neuertheleſſe were by God employed in extraordinary cõmiſſions, and to that end were extraordinarily aſſiſted by the Spirit of God. I ſay not, that their vocations were halfe ordinary and halfe extraordinary, but that they had their ordi-

nary vocation fully and wholly, and that beſides the ſame, they were inſpired with the holy Spirit for an extraordinary worke. Such were the faithfull ſeruants which God raiſed in our fathers times. But it is to be vnderſtood, that the ordinary vocation of *Ieremy*, *Ezechiel* and *Iohn Baptiſt*, was pure and entire; but their vocations were corrupted, which corruption by cuſtome had gotten the force of a Law: but they leauing the abuſe, and ſhaking off the yoke of the Popes tyranny, which endeuored to ſubiect all ordinary vocation to it ſelfe, conuerted that corrupted vocation to the right vſe thereof.

We muſt not thinke it more ſtrange, that an idolatrous & corrupted Church ſhould conferre a vocation, which ſhould be ſufficient to bind a man duly to performe the office of a Paſtor: for all oathes made concerning things that are iuſt and holy, whereinto a man hath not intruded himſelfe, ought inuiolably to be obſerued. Now in hereticall and idolatrous Churches, Paſtors are receiued and admitted vpon promiſe to teach the truth. Beſides, euery hereticall Church hath the chaire of the firſt inſtitution, and by the intention of the people, ordained to preach the purity of the Goſpell. Therefore the Councel of Nice in the 8. Canon ordained, that hereticall Clerks that had any charge among the Catharists or Nouatians, vpon their conuerſions to the Catholike Church, ſhould remaine in the ſame degree that they were in. Onely it ordained that they ſhould be receiued againe by impoſition of hands, which was not an ordinary impoſition of hands, but a ſimple bleſſing; * whereof there are many examples in the new Teſtament. The 69. Canon of the Code of the Affrican Councels ordaineth, that the Donatiſts Clerkes ſhould be receiued into the Clergy of the catholike Church, and remaine in their firſt dignity. Which is the ſubiect of Saint *Hieromes* Dialogue againſt the Luciferians, where he proueth, that as the Church receiueth thoſe which had been baptized by the Arians, ſo ſhe ought to receiue thoſe Biſhops which conuerted from Arianiſme, without taking their dignity from them.

* Acts 13. v. 3. Mat. 19. v 15. ἐστὶ κανονικὸς ὥστε δονατιστὴν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ τῆς καθολικῆς, ἐν κλήσει ἀναδέχεσθαι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀξίωσιν τιμῆς μένειν.

But hereby the Church of Rome hath no aduantage of vs,

as

as if we drew our vocation from her. For therein we giue no more authority to the Church of Rome, then to the Arian & Neſtorian Churches, ſeeing that we ſay that the moſt corrupt Church of all others, and wherein there is no ſaluation, loſeth not her power to conferre a vocation, which although it be corrupt, neuertheleſſe it bindeth a man to do his dutie, ſpecially when he is admitted vpon oath to teach the truth. The principall point is, that thoſe reformers of Papacy obſerued that which was good in their bad ordinary vocation, not from the Prelates which had conſecrated them after the Romiſh manner, but from Ieſus Chriſt & the Apoſtles, from whō theſe callings were firſt deriued. Euē as when the water of a cleare ſpring comes to vs thorow an vncleane channel, then infection cōmeth onely from that chānel, but the water comes frō the ſpring & firſt originall thereof: which cōming thicke and troubled vnto vs, our labour is commendable, if we ſeeke to make it runne cleare. It is one thing to haue a vocation by the meanes and miniſtery of the Church of Rome, and another thing to haue it from the Church of Rome, and from her authoritie. The authoritie of the calling comes from Ieſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles, and not from polluted hands thorow the which it hath paſt. The obligation to keepe a mans oath, comes not from him to whom the oath is made, but from God to whom we ſweare, who onely hath the power in his hands to puniſh periury. Therefore, if I promiſe a man to do two things, the one holy and iuſt, the other wicked and contrary to the Word of God; that mans authority cannot binde me to offend God, by keeping that which I haue euilly & raſhly promiſed. Promiſes made againſt God do not bind. A wicked oath is worſe to be obſerued. Therefore all the oathes made by Prieſts and Biſhops vnto the Pope, are voide and of no force; but the promiſe which they mak to preach the truth of the Word of God, bindeth them, and is inuiolable.

That which is ſaid before being well conſidered, is a ſufficient anſwer to that which they ask vs, which is, What miracles the firſt reformers did, to authorize their extraordinary

vocation. For this queſtion ought not to be put to thoſe which haue had the ordinary vocation vſed in the Church in their countries. Beſides, there were diuers Prophets extraordinarily raiſed, whom we find not to haue done any miracles, as *Oſea, Micheas, Malachy, &c. An euill and an adulterous generation ſeeketh a ſigne, Matth.* 12. 39. And if thoſe reformers of Papiſtrie had done miracles, their enemies being reſolute to contradict them, would preſently haue ſaid, that it was of them which Ieſus Chriſt ſaid, *There ſhall ariſe falſe prophets, ſhewing ſignes and wonders*, Math. 24. 24. Mark. 13. 22.

To conclude, all the meanes that our aduerſaries helpe themſelues withall in this queſtion, is a ſhift or a ſlight to hinder vs frō examining their doctrine. They buſie vs with diſputing vpon formalities, to keepe vs frō entring into the ground of the cauſe, with the ſame policy by the which the high Prieſts and Scribes asked Ieſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles the reaſon of their vocation. They buſie vs about callings, thereby to diuert vs from the examination of doctrine. It is neceſſary indeed that a Paſtor intrude not himſelfe, and that he be duly called: but it is not abſolutely neceſſary for the good of the people, that they ſhould exactly know the vocation of their Paſtors: they ſhall not be anſwerable for that at the day of Iudgement, but they are to giue an account of the obedience which they haue yeelded to the pure Word of God, though it were preached by an vſurper, whoſe vſurpation may be vnknowne to the people. For there is no man ſo fooliſhly ſcrupulous, which had not rather be led into Paradiſe by a man without a calling, then to be drawne into hell by a man laden with titles, hauing an ordinary vocation.

But the iniuſtice of our aduerſaries ſpecially appeareth herein, that they will haue all vocation in the Church to depend vpon the Pope, which is one of the greateſt abuſes in the Church of Rome, and hath moſt need of reformation. By this reckoning we muſt haue our vocation from the Pope, to preach againſt the Pope. And we muſt be ſilent, vntill ſuch time as ſome good Pope ſends ſome men expreſly to preach againſt himſelfe.

But

But that which was moſt neceſſarie for them to do, that is, to let the people ſee the originall of Eccleſiaſticall functions, & to ſhew them that Ieſus Chriſt inſtituted ſacrificers of his body: this is the thing which they neuer do, and which they will not once touch; and for feare leſt the people ſhould look clearely into it, they hide the holy Scripture from them, which onely gouerneth & directeth Eccleſiaſticall vocations, and propoundeth the firſt inſtitution thereof vnto vs.

ARNOVX.

They note no places of Scripture in the margent for proofe of this exception, nor of this neceſſitie, nor of this circumſtance of times, nor of pretended interruption, nor of men raiſed vp, nor of the extraordinary manner, nor of reſtoring the Church, nor of one onely word of the Article. 131. Sect.

MOVLIN.

To proue that in our time God raiſed certaine perſons by an extraordinary manner, and that reformation was neceſſarie, our Confeſſion produceth not any place of Scripture in the margent of this Article, becauſe that by places of the Scripture, we proue the points of our beliefe, but not what happened in our time in France; which are points contained in moderne hiſtories, and no Articles of faith. It ought not to ſeeme ſtrange, if in the Confeſſion of our Churches there are ſome points inſerted, wch are no Articles of faith. For as the title of the Decalogue is, The ten commandements of God: And yet theſe words, *I am a mightie God, zealous, viſiting the iniquitie of the fathers, &c.* and theſe words, *In ſixe dayes God made heauen and earth*, are not commandements, but reaſons whereupon God groundeth his commandements. So in the Confeſſion of faith, it was neceſſary to inſert ſome things which are not Articles of faith, but which ſerue to ſhew a reaſon why it was neceſſary for vs to oppoſe our ſelues againſt the Romiſh faith, by a contrary confeſſion of faith.

Touching the reſt, all the places of Scripture quoted in the margent

margent of our Confeſſion from the beginning to the ending touching thoſe Articles which are in controuerſie, are as many proofes and reaſons, to ſhew why in our time the reformation of the Church of Rome hath bene neceſſary.

ARNOVX.

Of the perpetuall ſtability of the Church of Rome.

132. Sect. *Becauſe motion is made to put the Church of Rome from her poſſeſſion, and to ſhew that Ieſus Chriſt hauing once giuen himſelfe vnto her as an inheritance, which ſhe hath held ſo many ages, as they confeſſe, hath withdrawne himſelfe from her: Or that ſhe being inheritrix of life, can die: and of the truth, can lie; and likewiſe of the way, can erre and be loſt.*

MOVLIN.

In all this diſcourſe there is not one true word, nor yet common ſenſe. It is falſe, that we go about to put the Church of Rome from any poſſeſſion. We come to helpe the Church of Rome, and ſhe complaines that we would take her goods from her; ſhe vnderſtands aide to be iniury. For thoſe that gouerne her, feare that the Goſpell will diminiſh their riches and great wealth: and that is the poſſeſſion for the which they diſpute.

It is falſe alſo, that we euer confeſſed that Ieſus Chriſt gaue himſelfe for an inheritance to the Church of Rome, in that ſence wch our aduerſary meaneth. By the Church of Rome, we vnderſtād the Church of the citie of Rome, to the which Ieſus Chriſt neuer gaue himſelfe for an inheritance, in other ſort, then to the Church of Corinth, Epheſus, or Conſtantinople. He made his couenant with thoſe Churches, with threatnings to take it away, and to remoue their candleſticke, incaſe of contempt or rebellion: a miſchiefe which hath happened to the Church of Rome. Life and truth are

riches,

riches, whereof the Church of Rome neuer was proprietary, although in the first age of the Church it was one of those Churches which professed the Word of God. The riches thereof which from age to age haue increased therein, by peruerting of manners, haue peruerted doctrine. For it hath beene forced to wrest the doctrine, to make it appliable to vices, to build an Empire, and to giue a particular Church the title and properties of the vniuersall Church. And if *M. Arnoux* will haue the Church of Rome to be seized in perpetuity of truth and life, without erring or falling away, he ought to produce places out of the Scripture, which confirme this prerogatiue vnto her. For there is no Church in the world, how wicked soeuer it be, which may not also brag & say of it selfe, that it cannot erre nor be ouerthrown. So the Iewes, conspiring against *Ieremy*, said, *The law shall not perish from the Priest, nor counsell from the wise, nor the word from the Prophet*, Iere. 18. 18. But God maketh them liers therein, saying, *The law shall perish from the Priest, and counsell from the ancient*, Ezechiel 7. 26. So Babylon speaketh, sitting vpon seuen hils, and exerciseth a traffick or merchandize of soules, Apoc. 18 7. *I sit being a Queene, and am no widow, and shall see no mourning.* Note this word *sit*, for that is the word which the Popes vse to denote their dominion. To conclude, I say I cannot erre, is the worst of all errors. That Church which saith, I cannot fall by error, is already fallen by pride, and lieth, in saying she cannot lie. In saying, that she is the rule, she exempteth her-selfe from all rule, and her fall is the lesse recouerable, because that being fallen, she still thinketh that she stands vpright. Neuertheless, to proue that the Church of Rome cannot erre, behold, what places of Scripture our aduersary setteth downe.

ARNOVX.

Daniel, 2. 44. the Prophet speaking of the Christian Church, vnder the word Queene, saith thus, And in the dayes of those Kings, shall the God of heauen set vp a kingdome, which shall neuer be destroyed, and the kingdome shall not be left to other people, but it 133. Sect.

shall

ſhall breake in pieces, and conſume all theſe kingdomes, and it ſhall ſtand for euer.

MOVLIN.

In this place there is no ſpeech of a Queene, nor yet of the Church of Rome. The Prophet ſpeaketh of a kingdome which ſhall endure for euer. Which is vnderſtood of the kingdome of the Saints, and the elect, who ſhall reigne with Ieſus Chriſt eternally in heauen, as *Daniel* himſelfe declareth, 7. 18. ſaying, *But the Saints of the moſt High ſhall take the kingdome, and poſſeſſe the kingdome for euer, euen for euer and euer.* If the Church of Rome be eternall, then after the day of Iudgement, there muſt be Popes eternally on earth.

ARNOVX.

134. Sect. *And Exodus 4. 1. Moſes making difficulty to go vnto Pharaoh to reforme him, and ſaying, They will not beleeue me, nor hearken to my voyce, for they will ſay, God hath not ſent him: God gaue him power to worke miracles, adding the reaſon, To the end that they may beleeue that the true God appeared vnto thee.*

MOVLIN.

If by theſe two places *M. Arnoux* pretends to proue that the Church cannot erre, he doth according to his accuſtomed manner, which is iuſt *quidlibet ex quolibet.* As when before he proued that the Church is viſible, becauſe it is written, *That God hath placed a pauilion in heauen for the Sunne,* Pſalme 19. and that ſhe is Apoſtolicall, becauſe it is written, *God doth iuſtice to the orphane and to him that is oppreſſed.* But if by this place he will proue the neceſſity of miracles, he digreſſeth from the queſtion, for this hath no coniunction with that which goeth before. Touching miracles we haue before ſpoken at large, and in the Section following we will ſpeake more. But where did he learne, that *Moſes* was ſent to *Pharao* to reforme him? To bring the Iſraelites out of Ægypt, is that to reforme *Pharao* or the religion of Ægypt?

ARNOVX.

ARNOVX.

And Iohn 10. 37. *If I do not the works of my Father, beleeue me not. To conclude, neither the Sonne of God, nor the Apostles, nor Moses, nor Elias, euer tooke on them to appeare, as being sent in an extraordinary manner, without hauing markes of their authoritie from God.*

MOVLIN.

Our Sauiour said, *If I do not the workes of my Father, beleeue me not.* Touching that, we haue already said, that as the miracles done by *Moses*, still serued to authorize the Law, euen after miracles ceased in Israel: so miracles done by Christ, and by the Apostles still serue at this day to authorize the Gospell, although miracles haue ceased. When King *Iosias* openly shewed the booke of the Law which had beene lost, 2. Kings 21. he did no miracle, because he propounded no new thing, but reestablished the ancient doctrine of the Law, sufficiently authorized by miracles at the publication thereof in Horeb. It belongs to them that teach new doctrine, to do miracles. *False prophets shall rise vp, and do great signes and miracles*, Matth. 24. 24. *The sonne of perdition shall shew signes and lying wonders*, 2. Thess. 2. 9. *An euill and an aduulterous generation seeketh a signe*, Matth. 12. 39. To those that shall say vnto Iesus Christ, *Haue not we in thy name cast out diuels?* it shal be said, *Depart from me, I neuer knew you*, Matth. 7. 23. These are places which seeme to haue been written expressly of our aduersaries, whose miracles at this day are all reduced to the casting out of diuels. For to restore sight to a man that was borne blind, or to raise a dead man to life againe, there is no speech of such matters, their Art extendeth not so farre. To conclude, all this is grounded vpon a false supposition, that we haue no ordinary vocation. Those which besides their extraordinary commission, haue ordinary vocation, need no miracles to authorize it. Now, this extraordinary commission is grounded vpon the necessity of reforming the Church of Rome, and vpon the euident corruption of ordinary vocation. 135 Sect.

THE

THE XXXII. ARTICLE.

Of the Confession of faith.

We also beleeue, that it is good and profitable, that such as are chosen to be Superintendents, should take order among themselues what meanes they should vse for the gouernement of the whole body, and yet in no sort to decline from that which is set downe vnto vs by our Lord Iesus Christ. Which hindreth not but that there may be particular orders and ordinances in euery place, as necessity requireth.

Our aduersary by his silence approoueth this Article.

THE XXXIII. ARTICLE.

Of Ecclesiasticall policie.

Notwithstanding we exclude all humane inuentiõs and all lawes which men introduce vnder shadow of, the seruice of God, whereby they would directly binde mens consciences. But onely we receiue such as serue to nourish concord, and to keepe all both high and low in obedience. Wherein we are to follow that which our Lord Iesus Christ declareth touching excommunication, which we approue and confesse to be necessary, with all the appertenances.

ARNOVX.

136. Sect. *That it is to shake off the yoake of Lawes and Ordinances, as well of the Church (the Spouse of Christ) as of Magistrates, to the which*

which they beleeue, that they muſt not obey, but by policie, and for order, not for conſcience ſake.

MOVLIN.

This Article tendeth not to ſhake off the ordinances of the Churches of God, but the ordinances of the Papall Church, whereby a tyrannicall yoke is laid vpon mens conſciences, and Chriſtian liberty oppreſſed.

Touching obedience due to Magiſtrates, there is nothing ſpoken thereof in this Article, that is referred to the laſt Article of our Confeſſion, where we ſhall ſee the contrary to that which *M. Arnoux* impoſeth vpon vs. For there we ſay, that God hath eſtabliſhed kingdomes and Principalities, that he will be knowne to be the author thereof, that we muſt obey them for Gods ſake, and that he will haue vs to pay them tributes, impoſts and other duties, &c. It is therefore a foule ſlander which our aduerſary impoſeth vpon vs, to ſay, that we beleeue that we muſt not obey Kings but by policy, and for order, and not for conſcience ſake. The Apoſtle *Paul*, Rom. 13.5. takes away all doubt thereof, when he ſaith, that *We muſt be ſubiect vnto higher powers, not becauſe of wrath onely, but alſo for conſcience ſake.*

But what is the cauſe, that when in this Article we ſpeake of humane inuentions, *M. Arnoux* thinketh, that vnder thoſe humane inuentions we vnderſtand the obedience which we owe to Magiſtrates lawes: but onely becauſe he eſteemeth the power of Magiſtrates to be a humane inuention, and not a diuine ordinãce? And heereafter in another place he calleth it a humane law. That is the opinion of the Doctors of the Church of Rome. *Bellarmine* maintaineth againſt *Barkley*, that the power of Kings is not *de iure diuino*. That is the apophthegme of *Binet* the Ieſuite, ſpeaking to *M. Caſaubon*, ſaying, That it was better that all Kings were ſlaine, then a Confeſſion ſhould be reuealed: becauſe Confeſſion is by diuine law, but the power of Princes is by humane law, as the ſaid *M. Caſaubon* witneſſeth in his Epiſtle written to *Fronton le Duc* the Ieſuite.

ARNOVX.

ARNOVX.

137. Sect. *For if they ſpeake of vniuſt lawes made by vnlawfull Magiſtrates, they neede not frame an Article for that matter in a Confeſſion of faith, where all things are ſuccinctly and compendiouſly ſet downe.*

MOVLIN.

In this Article of our Confeſſion, wee neither ſpeake of iuſt nor vniuſt lawes of Magiſtrates; for in it we ſpeake not any thing of the Magiſtrate. Howbeit vnder theſe words of vnlawfull Magiſtrates, the Ieſuite comprehends lawfull Magiſtrates: for they thinke, that to kill a King which is depoſed by the Pope, is not to kill a King, becauſe they eſteeme him no more a King, howſoeuer he reignes actually, whereof we will ſpeake hereafter.

ARNOVX.

138 Sect. *The Catholique Church teacheth Frenchmen, that the moſt Chriſtian ſtate of France is compoſed of two houſes, that is, Spirituall and Temporall: the laſt is to build vpon their King which is the ground, and the firſt to build vpon the holy Sea which is the chiefe corner ſtone: and in either of theſe two houſes they are bound as Chriſtians and Catholike Frenchmen, as well to the Lawes of the Church, as to the Kings Lawes, and to his Miniſters and Officers.*

MOVLIN.

All this diſcourſe concerneth not our Article, wherein there is nothing ſaid of Magiſtrates: howbeit al this diſcourſe ſounds ill in the mouth of Ieſuites, who place murtherers of Kings in the roll of Martyrs: witneſſe the Table which with mine owne eyes I haue ſeene in the Colledge de la Fleſche in the Fathers hall, where among Ieſuiticall martyrs, there are diuers which haue beene executed for ſuch parricides. Therefore *M. Arnoux* ought to abſtaine from this matter,

for

for the honour of his Order, and call to minde the iudgement againſt *Iohn Cheſtel*, and the puniſhment of *Guignard*, and the refuſall which the Ieſuites make yet at this day, by writing to condemne this propoſition, that the Pope cannot depoſe King: and rather to ſtay vpon the ſubſtance of our Article, wherein we ſpeake not of obedience due to Magiſtrates, but of Eccleſiaſticall diſcipline and policie, and ſpecially of Excommunication.

But he will be ſure not to meddle therewith, leſt he ſhould giue vs occaſion to lay open the abuſe, and the profnation of the vſe of the Keyes, which the Sonne of God hath giuen to all the Apoſtles and to their ſucceſſors, which are the faithfull paſtors of the Church.

Of the Excommunications of the Church of Rome.

The Church of Rome makes Admonitions and Excommunications to ſerue for the finding againe of things that are loſt. He that hath loſt an horſe, cauſeth an excommunication to be publiſhed againſt him that hath ſtolen it, if he bring it not againe. Whereby it happeneth ſometimes, that a father cauſeth his ſonne to be excommunicated not knowing it; and for the body of an horſe, cauſeth his ſonnes ſoule to be deliuered to the diuell. The Councell of Trent in the 25. Seſſion approueth theſe Excommunications made to find things loſt: but will haue none but Biſhops to publiſh them.

139. *Sect. Toletus lib. 1. De inſtructione ſacerdotali c. 8. Fertur excommunicatio in eum qui alicuid alteri ſuripuit.*

They do worſe then that: for they excommunicate for future time, and for ſinnes not yet committed. That is, the Biſhop pronounceth or cauſeth a writing to be pronounced, ſignifying thereby, that he excommunicateth all thoſe that ſhall touch the ſtockes or trees of the Lord of a towne or village, although no man hath once laid hand vpon them.

Tolet. lib. de Inſtruct. ſacerdotali ca. 8. Fulminatur in furam. Toletus Ibid.

At the requeſt of a creditor that hath a deſire to be paid his money, they excommunicate a debter, if he payeth not within a certaine time.

The Pope onely excommunicateth Kings, and cenſureth them: as *Emanuel Sa* the Ieſuite ſaith[a] in his Aphoriſmes. The example of *Ambroſe* diſliketh him, who being but Biſhop of Miliane, durſt take vpon him publikely to ſuſpend *Theodoſius* the Emperour without communicating the ſame to the Biſhop of Rome.

The Pope can giue power to a Lay man, yea and to a woman, to excommunicate; as Cardinal[b] *Tolet* after *Panormitanus* and *Antoninus* ſaith. For the keyes which are ſpoken of in the Scripture, are not tied to the preaching of the Goſpell, therefore diuers perſons vſe them which cannot preach the Goſpell.

[c] The Pope alſo may giue commiſsion to any one to excommunicate a man, without ſhewing him the cauſe or reaſon wherefore he doth it. As the ſame Cardinall ſaith, in the 16. chapter of the fift booke of the Inſtruction of Prieſts.

And if the Pope excommunicateth any man vniuſtly, (for they all confeſſe that he may iudge amiſſe, becauſe he may erre in action, and condemne him that is innocent, to be culpable) yet Pope *Gregorie* the 1. declareth, that the[d] ſentence of a Paſtor, whether it be iuſt or vniuſt, is to be feared.

But that which in this matter is moſt pernicious, is the common rule, that an excommunicated perſon is ſuſpended[e] of his charge, and cannot exerciſe any act of Iuriſdiction, and that all the ſentences which an excommunicated Iudge pronounceth, are of no force. By this rule the Pope pretendeth that he hath power to depoſe Kings, and to diſplace the Officers of the Crowne, and all Iudges, as well ſoueraigne as inferior, whom when it pleaſeth the Pope or the Prelates to excommunicate them, their acts, ordinances, and iudgements are of no effect, (if we beleeue the maximes of the Romiſh Church:) and by conſequence their places muſt be ſupplied by other perſons the Popes friends, that their iudgements may be auaileable.

Our Kings and their Officers and Courts of Parliament, are dealt withall in the like vniuſt manner in the Bull *de Cœna Domini*, which is a ſolemne excommunication which the Pope

a Eman. Sa. Aphoriſmi in voce excommunicatio. Reges à ſolo Papa excommunicantur & cenſuris ligantur.

b Tolet. Inſtruct. ſacerd. lib. 1. ca. 6. Fœmina excommunicare poteſt ex commiſſione Papæ, vt notant Panor. & Antoninus.

c Papa mandat vt aliquem excommunicet ſine aliqua cognitione cauſæ.

d Cauſa 11. Quæſt 3. Can Sententia paſtorum, ſiue iuſta ſiue iniuſta, timenda eſt.

e Tolet. lib. 1. Inſtr. ſacerd. c. 3. Excommunicatus non poteſt exercere actum iuriſdictionis abſque peccato, imò ſi publica eſt excommunicatio facta, ſententiæ nullæ ſunt.

Pope thundreth out euery yeere on Maundy Thurſday before Eaſter. Vpon which day the Pope appeareth ſtanding in a Porch of a gate, with two Peacokes tailes on each ſide of his eares or head, and there in the preſence of the people being aſſembled about him in Saint *Peters* Palace, he pronounceth a long excommunication; wherein expreſly he nameth the Chancellors, Preſidents and Counſellors of the Courts of Parliament, ordinarie Iudges, and extraordinarie Commiſsioners; as alſo Emperours, Kings, Dukes, &c. which ſhall appeale from the Pope to any future Councell: or that lay or impoſe new taxes and tallages vpon their ſubiects, without ſpeciall permiſſion from the Pope: or that take tithes of the Clergie: or that in any ſort take knowledge of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes. By which clauſes of excommunication, our Kings, and their Officers, and Courts of Parliament, are intangled, who euery day croſſe and contradict thoſe prohibitions; and for recompence of ſo many good deedes which the Pope receiueth from them, are excommunicated by the Pope, and euery yeere ſent to hell by the ſtrongeſt and moſt ſolemne excommunication which is made in the Church of Rome.

Our Churches in this 33. Article declare, that they approue not of excommunications made for things that are loſt, nor to moleſt men that are in debt, nor for future ſinnes not yet committed, but for ſcandall and rebellion againſt the Church, and perſeuerance in impenitencie, according to Ieſus Chriſts commandement, who ſpeaking of him that had wronged his brother, ordained, that if he deſpiſed the admonitions of the Church, he ſhould be eſteemed as a Pagan or an Infidell, and by conſequence, put out of the communion of the faithfull. For in the verſe following, he giueth faithfull Paſtors power to bind and to looſe ſinnes, with promiſe that their iudgement ſhall be ratified in heauen. Which power the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* will haue the Corinthians to vſe againſt the inceſtuous perſon, 1. Cor. 5. 3. ſaying, *Put away that wicked perſon from among you.*

ARNOVX.

140. *Sect.* *Places of Scripture alledged. And those that are alledged, in my iudgement are rather referred to certaine words which are lower in the Article, as that of Rom.* 19.17. *and* 1. *Cor* 3.3. *where the Apostle exhorteth Christians to shunne partialitie, and nothing else.*

MOVLIN.

The 33. Article of our Confession faith, that we receiue that which serues to nourish concord, and thereupon noteth, Rom. 16.17. where the Apostle saith, *I beseech you brethren, marke them diligently which cause diuision and offences.* And 1. Cor. 3.3. *For whereas there is among you enuy, and strife, and diuision, are you not carnall?* Nothing can be quoted that is fitter to the purpose.

ARNOVX.

141. *Sect.* *These places are nothing to the purpose to weaken the force and vigour of humane lawes, which are good, and made by those whom God hath established, but serue onely to appease seditions, and to breake ciuill faction.*

MOVLIN.

I grant that those places may be fitly vrged against seditious and quarrelsome persons, and we alledge them to no other end; not to dispence with humane lawes, I meane, such as *M. Arnoux* vnderstands by humane lawes, to wit, the ordinance of God to obey kings, calling that a humane law, thereby to embase the authority of our Soueraignes, by perswading vs that their authoritie is not deriued from the diuine Law of God.

ARNOVX.

142. *Sect.* *Contrary places of Scripture. Luke* 10. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.*

MOVLIN.

Our 23. Article reiecteth humane inuentions. But in this place

place of Luke 10.16. which *M. Arnoux* oppoſeth againſt vs, our Lord Ieſus Chriſt commandeth to obey the Apoſtles and all faithfull Paſtors which ſpeake in his name. Which if *M. Arnoux* placeth among humane inuentions, I know not what elſe is diuine. Therefore this place is ſo farre from making any thing againſt our Article, that it is little leſſe then blaſphemie to wreſt it to eſtabliſh humane inuentions.

ARNOVX.

And Rom. 13. 2. Whoſoeuer therefore reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God, and they that reſiſt, ſhall receiue to themſelues condemnation. And verſe 5. Wherefore we muſt be ſubiect, not becauſe of wrath onely, but alſo for conſcience ſake. Therefore we cannot ſay that the obſeruation of humane lawes belongeth not to the ſeruice of God, nor binde the conſcience. 143. Sect.

MOVLIN.

Humane lawes, that is, humane inuentions, and mens traditions, which corrupt pietie, burthen mens conſciences, and draw money from the people vnder pretence of deuotion, are condemned by our 33. Article. But touching obedience due to Magiſtrates, whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, we call it not a humane law, but a diuine conſtitution. *M. Arnoux*, which calleth it a humane law, offendeth the Maieſtie of our Kings, and vnder a ſhew to exhort men to obey them, vnderminеth their authoritie.

FINIS.

THE SECOND PART OF THE DEFENCE OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH, MADE by the Reformed Churches of France:

WHEREIN THE DOCTRINE OF THE ſaid Churches touching the Sacraments of the Chriſtian Church, and the Power and authority of Magiſtrates, is maintained, againſt the obiections of M. Arnoux the Ieſuite.

THE XXXIIII. ARTICLE.

Of the Confeſsion of the faith of the Reformed Churches.

WE beleeue that the Sacraments are added to the word for ampler confirmation, to be pledges and tokens of the grace of God, and by that meanes to helpe and ſtrengthen our faith, becauſe of the infirmitie and hardneſſe of beliefe which is in vs: and that they are in ſuch ſort exterior ſignes, that by them God worketh through the power of his Spirit, that nothing by them ſhould be ſignified to vs in vaine. And yet we beleeue that all the ſubſtance and truth

truth of them is in Ieſus Chriſt: and that if they be ſeparated from him, they are nothing but ſhadowes and ſmoke.

C. The Aduerſarie paſſeth ouer this Article, and approueth it by his ſilence.

THE XXXV. ARTICLE.

Of the number of Sacraments.

We confeſſe onely two Sacraments, and thoſe common to all the Church, whereof the firſt, which is Baptiſme, is giuen vnto vs for a teſtimony of our adoption, becauſe that thereby we are ingrafted into the body of Chriſt, that we might be waſhed and cleanſed by his bloud, and after renewed in holineſſe of life by his Spirit. We alſo beleeue, that although we are but once baptized, that the benefit which thereby is ſignified vnto vs, extendeth both to life & death, that we might haue a permanent ſigne or ſeale that Ieſus Chriſt will alwayes be righteouſneſſe and ſanctification vnto vs. Now although it be a Sacrament of faith and repentance, neuertheleſſe becauſe God receiueth little children together with their parents into his Church, we ſay, that by the authoritie from Ieſus Chriſt, yong children begotten by faithfull parents, ought to be baptized.

ARNOVX.

After they haue cut off part of the Scriptures by the 5. *Article,* 1. Sect. *the merits of workes by the* 22. *Article, and works of perfection*

by the 24. Article, they proceed further to the cutting off of the Sacraments practized in all times in the Church of God, according to the inſtitution of Ieſus Chriſt.

MOVLIN.

We haue cut nothing off from the holy Scriptures: for we cannot cut that off which was neuer of them. The bookes of *Iudith, Tobias, Machabees, &c.* are not found in the Hebrew Bibles, which are the originall of the old Teſtament. Moreouer, they are full of fables, as we haue proued. The Church of Rome is the onely Church that dares be ſo bold to cut off the Scripture, taking the ſecond Commandement of the Law of God out of it in their Ladies Houres and Seruice bookes.

Touching merits by which God is made debter to men; and touching workes of perfection which are called ſupererogatorie, whereby a man exceeds the Law of God, and doth more good then God will haue him to do, we reiect them, becauſe God reiecteth them, as we haue prooued before in the 70. Section of the firſt booke.

Touching the Sacraments, we receiue all thoſe which Ieſus Chriſt hath ordained: and reiect the Sacrament of Confirmation, the Sacrament of Penance, the Sacrament of Marriage, the Sacrament of extreme Vnction, and the Sacrament of Orders: becauſe they are no Sacraments of the orthodox all Catholike Church, but of the Church of Rome. Of each of which it is neceſſarie that we ſay ſomething.

Of the pretended Sacrament of Confirmation.

2. Sect. *Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 7. cap. 9.*

Confirmation is a Sacrament of the Church of Rome not to be reiterated, which ought to be celebrated faſting, which imprinteth an indebile character in the ſoule, and which is not conferred but by a Biſhop: wherein there are Godfathers and Godmothers, betweene whom and the child that is confirmed

firmed by that Sacrament, there is a ſpirituall parentage begotten, which hindereth marriage, and which alſo cauſeth the diſſolution of marriage, notwithſtanding the prohibition made by Ieſus Chriſt, forbidding the diſſolution of marriage, vnleſſe it be for adultery, ſaying, Matth. 5.32. and 19.6,9. *Let no man therefore put aſunder that which God hath coupled together, &c.* Neuertheleſſe the Pope by ſpeciall priuiledge ſometimes permitteth a man to marry his goſſip: as it is ſaid in the booke of the Taxing of the Apoſtolicall Chancery, where the Datarie of the Popes Bulles which hath made this taxe, ſpeaketh in the 23. leafe, ſaying,* *A diſpenſation to contract marriage betweene ſpirituall kindred, coſteth 60 groats, neuertheleſſe I granted one for 50 groats; but that was done by fauour.*

Pontificale c. De confir. Hoc Sacramento, contrahitur ſpiritualis cognacio impediens matrimonium contrahendum, & dirimens contractum. Idque contra Decretum Concilii Cabilonen. ſi. 2, c. 31.

* *Diſpenſatio de contrahendo in cognatione ſpirituali g. 60 Expedius tamen vnam pro gr. 50. ſed de gratia.*

This Sacrament is adminiſtred in this manner: A child is preſented to the Biſhop by a God father, if it be a ſonne, or by a Godmother if it be a daughter. The Biſhop ſits downe, waſheth his hands, layeth them vpon his breſt, and ſayes certaine prayers, by the which he asketh or requireth the ſeuenfold ſpirit. Then he asketh the Godfather the childs name, and dipping his right thombe in the ſacred oyle, which is called Chriſme, which they bring in a bottle, whereon the Biſhop breatheth to ſanctifie it, ſpeaketh to the oyle, ſaying, *Aue Chriſma*, I ſalute thee Chriſme.

That done, the Biſhop anoints the childs forehead therewith in manner of a croſſe, ſaying, *Signo te ſigno crucis, & confirmo te chriſmate ſalutis, in nomine Patris, Filii, & Spiritus ſancti.* I marke thee with the ſigne of the croſſe, and confirme thee by the Chriſme of ſaluation, in the name of the Father, &c.

After that he giues the child a blow on the eare, to ſtrengthen him in the faith, then he kiſſeth it, and hauing rubbed his thombe with crums of bread, after many ſignes of the croſſe by him made, he commands the Godfathers and Godmothers to teach the child the Creed, the *Pater noſter* and *Aue Maria.*

While this is doing, the child, if it can ſtand vpright, ſetteth his right foote vpon the right foot of his Godfather or Godmother,

mother, if it be a daughter. The action ended, they bind the childes forehead with a cloth, & vpon the band put certaine golden spangles in manner of a crosse, and so the whole action is ended.

Touching the efficacie and fruite of this Sacrament, the Canon *Omnes*, in the 5. Distinction of Consecration, saith, That all the faithfull ought to receiue this Sacrament, *Vt pleni Christiani inueniantur*, to the end they may be found to be full Christians; as if without that Sacrament they were but halfe Christians. Therefore also in the same Distinction, in the Canon, *Vt ieiuni*, it is said, *That he shall neuer be a Christian, which hath not beene anointed by Episcopall Confirmation.* Following this doctrine, *Thomas* the Angelicall Doctor, in the third part of his Summes, 72. question, Article 9.[a] saith, *This Sacrament is administred to giue perfection to Baptisme*, as if without Confirmatiõ Baptisme were imperfect. Therfore also the rules of the Romish Church import, that this Sacramẽt ought to be more honorable then Baptisme: as it is expressly said in the Canon *De his*, in the fift Distinction of Consecration, which saith,[b] *This Sacrament ought to be reuerenced and obserued with greater reuerence then Baptisme.* Neuertheless, to mitigate the matter there is added,[c] That *these two Sacraments are in such manner conioyned, that they can by no meanes be separated one from the other, vnlesse death preuent them, and that the one cannot be perfect without the other.* Then by this reckoning, Baptisme is either nothing or imperfect without Confirmation.

Bellarmine in the first chapter of the booke of Confirmation, maketh Confirmation worthier then Baptisme in three things, first, *Ratione Ministri*, In consideratiõ of him which administreth it, which ought to be a Bishop, but Baptisme may be administred in the Church of Rome by a porter and by a woman. Secondly, *Ratione subiecti*, in consideration of the subiect, that is, of the part of the body, for Confirmation is done in the forehead. Which are two comparisons as wisely made, as if a Prince hauing giuen a penny for an almes, and a subiect hauing giuen 10. crowns, I should say, that that penny is

Nunquam venit Christianus, nisi in Confirmatione Episcopali fuerit Chrismatus.

[a] *Hoc Sacramentum est perfectiuum Baptismi.*

[b] *Maiori veneratione venerandum est & tenendum.*

[c] *Sed ita connexa sunt hec duo sacramenta vt ab inuicem nisi morte preueniente nullatenus possint separari, & vnum sine altero perfici non possit.*

§ *Denique. Idcirco tam ratione Ministri, quam ratione subiecti, præstat Confirmatio Baptismo, vt rectè dicit Magister.*

Vide Costerum Augment. enchiridy de Sacram. Confirm.

is of more worth then the ten crownes, becauſe of the quality of the giuer, and becauſe the one layd the penny vpon the poore mans head, and the other put the ten crownes into his hand. Thirdly and laſtly, he will haue Confirmation to ſurpaſſe Baptiſme, *Ratione virtutis*, becauſe of the vertue, which is the principall point. For in the beginning of the 11. chapter he ſaith, that this Sacramẽt conferreth a grace which maketh the perſon acceptable, yea a greater grace then that which is conferred by Baptiſme, as touching this point to fortifie the ſoule againſt the aſſaults of the diuell. To that end the blow on the eare ſerueth. Which being ſo, I maruell why Ieſus Chriſt would be baptized, and did not thinke vpon receiuing of the Sacrament of Confirmation.

The 25. Article of our Confeſſion, by receiuing none but Baptiſme and the holy Supper for Sacraments in the Chriſtian Church, ſilently reiecteth this Sacrament of Confirmation, as iniurious to Baptiſme, ſeeing that the Church of Rome in the places aforeſaid, is not content to make Baptiſme inferior in dignitie to Confirmation, but alſo accuſeth Baptiſme of imperfection, adding a Sacrament thereunto, without the which men are but halfe Chriſtians, and which ſupplieth the want and imperfection of Baptiſme.

But I will paſſe ouer all theſe trifles of ceremonies, which haue a ſhew of coniuration. Our aduerſaries, to proue this Confirmation by the Scripture, ſay that Ieſus Chriſt the ſame day when he inſtituted the holy Supper, taught his Apoſtles to conſecrate the Chriſme which they vſe in Confirmation: which is ſome dreamers tale: whereupon neuertheleſſe the cuſtome in the Church of Rome to conſecrate the oile on Thurſday before Eaſter day is grounded. This fable is found in a Decretall of * Pope *Fabian*, the which (as others of the three firſt * Ages) is acknowledged to be falſe by the wiſeſt among our Aduerſaries. This is rather to mocke then to defend the cauſe, that they ground their Confirmation vpon this, that the holy Spirit deſcended vpon the Apoſtles in forme of fierie tongues. From whence they inferre, that a Biſhop ought to anoint and ſtrike a child, to ſtrengthen him.

* *Ep. ad Orientales.*
* *Baron. tom. 6. and annum 861. Sect. 5. 9. 7. quas dubias eſſe non dubium eſt. Item, illis actis uetitiis & recens inuentis non eget Eccleſia.*

him in the faith. *Tobias* Dog might as well ſerue for a proofe thereof. But our Aduerſaries miſtake themſelues. They haue no better reaſon to ground their Cõfirmation vpon Acts 8.16. and 19.6. of the ſame, where the Apoſtles laid hands vpon certaine perſons that were already baptized, who by that laying on of hands receiued the holy Ghoſt. For is there any thing ſpoken of Chriſme or Vnction in thoſe places? which is the eſſence of this pretended Sacrament; for in the very forme which they vſe in Confirmation there is mention of theſe things, as alſo of the blow, and of the head-band, and of ſuch inuentions. The Impoſition of hands by the Apoſtles, was not to celebrate a Sacrament to perfect or ſtrengthen Baptiſme, but to conferre miraculous and extraordinarie gifts, as it is ſaid, Acts 19.6. *After Paul had laid his hands vpon them, the holy Ghoſt came on them, and they ſpake the tongues, and propheſied.* The ſame appeares Acts 8. where *Simon Magus* offered money, perceiuing that by impoſition of hands the Apoſtles gaue the holy Ghoſt; which he could not haue ſeene, if ſome viſible and extraordinarie miracle had not bene ſhewed. Certainly he would haue giuen nothing for the Confirmation of the Romiſh Church. Thoſe extraordinarie graces were ſometimes conferred before Baptiſme, as Acts 10.14, to *Cornelius* and his familie. Which makes *Bellarmine* in his 47. booke of extreme Vnction, cap. 2. to ſay, that Confirmation was giuen to *Cornelius* before Baptiſme: a thing neuertheleſſe forbidden in the Church of Rome.

Touching the word Sacrament, if any man will call this impoſition of hands by the Apoſtles a Sacrament, we will not conteſt with them touching that, for it was a ſacred ſigne of the graces of God, as of old the Serpent of braſſe, & at this day the Rainebow are the like. But they are not Sacraments in that ſtrict ſenſe in which the word Sacrament at this day is taken: that is, for a ſacred ſigne of Ieſus Chriſt, and of his graces, common to all beleeuers, and perpetuall in the Chriſtian Church. Of ſuch Sacraments we acknowledge but two, that is, Baptiſme and the Lords Supper, becauſe Ieſus Chriſt ordained but theſe two. Saint *Auguſtine*, in his 118. Epiſtle 9. chap.

9. chapter, 3. booke of Christian Doctrine, restraineth himselfe to these * two Sacraments; and it is vsuall with him to say, That the Sacraments of the Christian Church issued out of our Lords side, when bloud and water came out of it.

Saint *Ambrose* his booke of Sacraments speaketh but of Baptisme and the Eucharist. When the Fathers call other ceremonies Sacraments, they take that word in another generall signification, whereby they call the Gospell a Sacrament, and the Incarnation a Sacrament, and to be short, all other things wherein there is any sacred mysterie.

The ceremony of ancient Christians to impose hands with vnction, was not a Sacrament apart, but was done at the time of Baptisme, presently after Baptisme was done, if it were possible. For the manner was, that the Catechumeni were baptized by troupes. And in the same place, after they were baptized, they receiued the vnction with imposition of hands by the Bishop, and were exhorted to perseuerance in faith. Which was no part of Baptisme, but a dependance and a ceremonie, nothing like to the Confirmation practized in the Church of Rome. The Supplement of *Philastrius* puts this among the errours of the Greeks, to wit, that they hold the Pope and all the Latin Churches for excommunicated, and that they conferred Confirmation presently after Baptisme.

The Church of England retaineth that which is commendable in this custome, where Confirmation is no other thing but a profession which the child (hauing attained to the age of discretion) maketh to keepe the promise which his Godfathers & Godmothers made in his name when he was baptized, and answereth touching his faith and instructiō: which done, he receyueth the Imposition of hands, and the blessing of the Bishop: which ceremonie is not called nor held by them a Sacrament. Our Churches in stead of that, cause children to be presented at Catechizing, and to answer publikely touching their faith, before were admit them to the holy Supper: which is done with prayer, that it will please God to extend his blessing on them. Which customes being of their nature free touching exterior forme and order, the end there-

* *Sacramentis numero pauciſſimis, obſeruatione facillimis, ſignificatione præſtantiſſimis, ſocietatem noui populi colligauit, ſicuti eſt baptiſmus, Trinitatis nomine conſecratus, & communicatio corporis & ſanguinis ipſius, & ſi quid aliud in Scripturis Canonicis commendatur.*

Græci hæretici, qui Pontificem & Latinos omnes habent pro excommunicatis, ſacramentum confirmationis paruulis ſuis mox poſt baptiſmum conferunt per ſimplices ſacerdotes.

thereof ought to be the welfare and inſtruction of thoſe which are in that manner receiued, together with the edification of the Church.

Of the Sacrament of Penance.

3. Sect.

The word *Repentance* in French, and the word *Penitence* in Latin, are all one thing. Penitence is the conuerſion of a ſinner, which conſiſteth in griefe for his ſinnes fore-paſſed, and in amendment of life in time to come. The Hebrewes call this vertue, a Returning vnto God, and the Greekes, an After-mind and changing of the will.

Teſſuba μετανοια.

The Church of Rome, to peruert the thing, hath corrupted the ſignification of the word. For Penitence in the Church of Rome is taken for whippings, faſtings, pilgrimages, and corporall and pecuniarie puniſhments. Of a vertue they haue made a puniſhment: and of a repentance of the heart, a corporall exerciſe: according to the manner of falſe religions, which change vertues into outward ſhewes, and into corporall exerciſes, whereof the Apoſtle 1. Tim. 4. 8. ſaith, *Bodily exerciſe profiteth little, but godlineſſe is profitable to all things, which hath the promiſe of the life preſent, and of that that is to come.*

Optima pœnitentia nouæ vita.

Luther acknowledging this abuſe, preached, that the beſt Penance of all is for a man to amend his life, and to become an honeſt man. For which hereſie, among many the like, he is blaſted with thundrings & excommunications, in the Bull *Exurge* of Pope *Leo* the 10. which is at the end of the laſt Councell of Latran, where he is condemned, for ſaying that *the beſt Penance is a new life.* In which Sentence of condemnation Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe is compriſed, who, Apocalypſe 2. 5. ſpeaketh thus to the Church of Epheſus, ſaying, *Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the firſt workes.* In the Romiſh tranſlation it is, *Age Pœnitentiam*, do Penance. Which Ieſus Chriſt maketh to conſiſt in the ſtudy of good workes.

The

The difference betweene vs is not, whether Penance be neceſſarie to ſaluation, and whether we muſt confeſſe our ſinnes and turne vnto God by carneſt repentance: but whether this Penance is a Sacrament or a ſacred ſigne, wherein a contrite ſinner ought punctually to confeſſe his ſinnes to his Curate, from him to receiue iudiciall abſolution, vpon condition to make ſatisfaction vnto God by corporall or pecuniarie Penance, which whoſoeuer doth not accompliſh in this life, ſhall accompliſh it in Purgatorie, from whence neuertheleſſe the Pope drawes out mens ſoules by Pardons.

We ſay, that admit there were no cuill at all in this, and that this kind of Penance were conformable to the Word of God, yet it can in no wiſe be a Sacrament: Our reaſons are theſe.

1 All our aduerſaries with vs acknowledge, that euery Sacrament is a ſacred and a viſible ſigne of an inuiſible grace of God. The Romith Decretall in the ſecond Diſtinction of Conſecration, maketh this definition of a Sacrament, drawne out of Saint *Auguſtine*: *A Sacrament is a forme or viſible apparence of an inuiſible grace.* And this ſentence of Saint *Auguſtine* is receyued among our aduerſaries, That the word ought tobe added to the element to make it a Sacrament. That being granted, it is manifeſt that this Penance is no Sacrament: for where is the element? where is the viſible ſigne inſtituted by Chriſt? for they compoſe this Sacrament of foure pieces, which are, Contrition, Confeſsion, Abſolution, and Satisfaction. Contrition of the heart is no ſenſible nor viſible ſigne. Confeſsion alſo is no ſigne of the grace of God, but a declaration that we are vnworthy of his grace. Confeſsion is not ordained to ſignifie the grace of God, but to aske it. Moreouer the ſacred ſignes ought to be adminiſtred by the Paſtor, but Confeſsion is made by euery particular man. I ſay the ſame of corporall or pecuniary Satisfactions, which are accompliſhed by the ſinner, and commonly in his houſe, by faſtings and whippings, or abroad by pilgrimages: whereas ſacred ſignes are adminiſtred in the Church, by the hands of the Paſtor. Abſolution alſo cannot be be a ſacred ſigne of the

Can. Sacrificium. Sacramentum eſt inuiſibilis gratiæ viſibilis formæ.

grace

grace of God: seeing that if it be good and auaileable, it is the grace of God. Adde hereunto, that this absolution is not an element nor a visible signe of an inuisible grace, for the words are not seene. If they answer, that it is sufficient that significantly it is the grace of God, I say, that by the same reason the preaching of the word of God is a Sacrament, for it is sensible, and a signification of the grace of God. It is not sufficient that Sacraments should be sensible signes, they must be visible, as the definition aforesaid saith, which is drawne out of the ancient Fathers, and receiued by the Church of Rome. The word must be ioyned to the element, but here they will haue the word to be an element.

I confesse, that the imposition of the Priests hands is a visible signe, but it is no element, but an action, as the distribution of the bread in the Supper is not the element, but the bread sanctified. Moreouer this imposition of hands was not ordained by Iesus Christ, for he did not command that the Priest should lay his hands on a man to conferre Sacramentall absolution. If these words, *absoluo te, &c.* be a visible signe, or a sensible element, by the same reason these words in Baptisme, *Baptizo te, &c.* should be a sensible signe, and an element, and not a word added to the element to make it a Sacrament. Certes in disputing with our aduersaries we are constrained to speake as it were to children, to beate into them the first principles of reason and common sense.

2 The proofes which follow, are no lesse plaine and euident. Our aduersaries make Contrition of the heart the first part of this Sacrament, which Contrition and griefe of heart is so necessary, that without it Penance is a kind of mockerie, and a meere hypocrisie. But thereby they wound and ouerthrow their imaginarie Sacrament: for besides the absurditie therein found, which, is to make a vertue or a disposition of the soule, part of a Sacrament, as if one should make faith part of the holy Supper, there is a further matter, which is, that the Priest is vncertaine whether thereby he conferreth a Sacrament, because he cannot be assured of the Contrition of the sinner, and knoweth not whether the declaration

tion

tion which the ſinner maketh, to be ſorry for offending God, be true or fained. And yet if that Contrition be not had, there is no repentance, and by conſequence no Sacrament of Penance. Surely this muſt needs bee a preſumptiue Sacrament which a man muſt gueſſe at, and a Sacrament which dependeth vpon the will and diſpoſition of the ſinner, who if hee will, can make it no Sacrament.

3 Adde hereunto, that all Sacraments are miniſtred by the Paſtor; but of this Sacrament three parts (that is, Contrition, Confeſſion, and Satisfaction) are done by euery particular man, who, if he be but halfe contrite, if he maketh but halfe a Confeſſion, if he maketh but halfe Satisfaction, it is but halfe a Sacrament: which are extrauagant conceptions, and a ſtrange kinde of an irregular Sacrament.

4 But the groſſeſt abſurdity of all appeareth in this, that oftentimes the Prieſt enioynes a ſinner to make ſatisfaction within diuers yeeres: in the ancient penitentiall Canons, there are penances found of 10. and of 20. yeeres. Then ſeeing that this ſatisfaction is a part of the Sacrament of penance, we may ſay that a man is 20. yeeres adminiſtring a Sacrament, as if a man ſhould employ 7. or 8. yeeres to baptize a child, or to conferre extreme vnction. But this is worſe: for there are ſatisfactions which are made by reſpits or ſpaces of time, as when a ſinner is condemned to faſt three dayes in a weeke, for the ſpace of three yeeres. This then is a Sacrament which is celebrated by reſpits, and hath a thouſand delayes: ſo full of inuentions is ſuperſtition, and our aduerſaries ſo ingenious to diſguiſe religion.

5 But to ſhew the roote of this euill, if Penance be a Sacrament of the Chriſtian Church, then Ieſus Chriſt ordained it. The Councell of Trent in the 14. Seſſion and firſt Chapter, findeth the inſtitution thereof in the 20. Chapter of Saint *Iohn*, where Ieſus Chriſt blowing vpon the Apoſtles, ſaid vnto them, *Receiue the holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſinnes ſoeuer ye remit, they are remitted vnto them, and whoſe ſinnes ſoeuer ye retaine, they are retained.* In theſe words of Ieſus Chriſt, our aduerſaries (which inferre *quidlibet ex quolibet*) finde Auricular Confeſ-

sion, and pecuniary and corporall Satisfaction.

Note that these words are spoken to the Apostles after the resurrection of our Lord. Whence it followeth, that repentance preached by the Prophets, was no Sacrament. And in the Gospell, when S. *John Baptist* preached, saying: *Repent: for the kingdome of God is at hand*; that repentance was no Sacrament, for then Iesus Christ was not risen againe. And which is more, when in Marke 1. 15. Iesus Christ said, *Repent and beleeue the Gospell*: that repentance was no Sacrament: For then the Lord was not yet risen againe. And after the resurrection of Iesus Christ, Acts 2. 38. when Saint *Peter* exhorted the Iewes, (not then baptized) to repent, saying, *Agite pœnitentiam, Repent, or amend your liues*: that repentance was no Sacrament: for the Councell of Trent in the same place saith, That Penance is no Sacrament before Baptisme. There is no other Penance found to be in the Scripture, and it is not to be found that this word Penance is proued to be a Sacrament, or an exterior signe of the Grace of God, but is said to be an earnest conuersion and an amendment of life. With the which Penance if we content our selues, we cannot be blamed for not receiuing other Penance then that which the Prophets, *Iohn Baptist*, Iesus Christ, and the Apostles preached.

Matt. 3.

Vulgata pœnitemini.

Nec ante admentum ebriſti pœnitentia erat Sacramentum, nec eſt poſt aduentum illius cuiquam ante Baptiſmum

6 And if we must haue a Sacrament of Penance, wee haue Baptisme, whereof S. *Mark.* speaketh thus in his first Chapter, verse, 4. saying, *Iohn preached the Baptisme of amendment of life, for remission of sinnes.*

Which hindereth not, but that after Baptisme we should seeke to amend our liues, and bring forth fruits worthy of repentance. That also is no hinderance, but that all faithfull Pastors, as successors of the Apostles, may bind and loose: of which power we will speake hereafter.

5. *Of Auricular Confession, a part of the Sacrament of Penance.*

Confession of sinnes is necessary to saluation. *He that conuerteth*

eth his sinnes, shall not prosper, but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them, shall haue mercy, saith *Salomon*. So sinners came to *Iohn Baptist* confessing their sinnes. This Confession is made, either to God only, or publickly to the Church, or priuately to the Minister of the Church, or to our neighbours whom we haue offended. All these Confessions are good, and are practised in our Churches: wherein, besides the Confession which euery one maketh apart vnto God, the Confession of sinnes publickly committed and knowne to the most part of the people, are made publickly before the Church: which publicke Confession the Councell of Trent commandeth, & saith, that the Apostle, 1. Tim. 5. 20. ordained it. It was the manner of the ancient Church publickly to confesse their faults: As *Socrates* and *Zozemenus* witnesse.

Prou. 28. 13.

Sess. 24. cap. 8. in Decreto de reformatione. Apostolus monet publice peccantes palam esse corripiendos.

Socrat. l. 5. ca. 19. Soz. l. 7 c. 16.

Besides this publicke Confession, we haue priuate Confessions of faults that are not publicke, which are made, either to the Minister alone, when the sinner comes vnto him priuatly to discharge his conscience, and to seeke for comfort and assurance of remission of sinnes; or to the Consistorie, which is with vs, the assembly of Pastors and Ancients, to whom the managing of Ecclesiasticall discipline among vs belongeth.

Finally there are confessions of sins, which particular persons mutually make one to another, after they haue offended one the other, of which mutuall confessions Saint *Iames* 5. 16. speaketh, saying: *Acknowledge your sinnes one to another, and pray one for another.* The Greeke and the Latin word signifie, *Confesse your faults mutually and reciprocally.* That which is added, *And pray one for another*, euidently sheweth, that as Saint *Iames* commandeth vs not to pray onely for Priests: so he doth not command vs to confesse our faults onely to Priests. He speaketh therefore of a reciprocall prayer, and of a mutuall succour, as also of a mutuall Confession to be made betweene particular persons after quarrels and offences giuen. So Saint *Augustine* vnderstood it in his 54. Epistle, saying, *The righteous are intercessors vnto God for sinners, Sinners themselues are admonished to do it one for another. For it is written, Confesse your sinnes mutually, and pray one for another.*

ἀλλήλοις.

Intercessores sunt apud Deum pro peccatoribus iusti, hoc pro seipsis peccatis inuicem vt faciant admonentur.

ther. Cardinall *Caietan* doth the like in his commentary vpon this Epiſtle, ſaying, * *Here it is not ſpoken of ſacramentall Confeſſion, as it appeareth by that which is ſaid, Confeſſe your ſinnes one vnto another. But ſacramentall Confeſſion is not made one vnto another, but onely to the Prieſt. The Apoſtle ſpeaketh of that Confeſſion whereby wee mutually acknowledge our ſelues to be ſinners, that men may pray for vs, and of the Confeſſion of faults which are made on either ſide, to appeaſe and reconcile men mutually together.*

* *Nec eſt hic ſermo de confeſſione ſacramenti, vt patet ex eo quod dicit, confitemini inuicem, &c.*

If Saint *Iames* did hereby command vs to confeſſe our ſins to the Prieſt, yet that makes nothing againſt vs which admit this Confeſſion; we onely reiect auricular Confeſſion, which all the Eaſt Church reiecteth: and that racking of conſciences which bindeth a man to tell all his thoughts in the eares of a man, and not onely to diſcouer all his ſinnes vnto him, but alſo all the particular circumſtances, which change (as the Councell of Trent ſaith) the nature of ſinne. Whereof if a man willingly omitteth any thing, the abſolution is voyde, and the Confeſſion without fruite. Beſides, the ſilence of this ſecret Confeſſion is ſo inuiolable, that when by a Confeſſion a Prieſt ſhal haue vnderſtanding of any enterpriſe to be made againſt a king, he may not diſcloſe it. No more do we allow of the diſtinctiō which the Councell of Trent maketh, which ordaineth that a man ſhall confeſſe all his mortall ſinnes, but touching veniall ſinnes, (that is, ſuch as are pardonable) it bindeth him not to confeſſe them. By this meanes a man ſhall confeſſe nothing: for mortall ſinnes are pardonable to thoſe that repent and amend their liues.

Seſſ. 14. can. 7.

Seſſ. 14. can. 5.

The fruit of this auricular Confeſſion is, Firſt, that Prieſts and confeſſors make themſelues fearefull to thoſe whoſe iniquities they know. Secondly, hereby they know the ſecrets, infirmities, and purpoſes of Princes, whereof the Pope is preſently aduertiſed. Thirdly, that in a rebellion of ſubiects againſt an excommunicated Prince, they perſwade bloudſhedding and rebellion ſecretly in the peoples eares, as it happened in the laſt troubles. Fourthly, that thereby they know all the diſhoneſt women in a towne, and know thoſe with whom

whom they may commit fornication or adultery without difficulty. Fifthly, that thereby they take pleasure in asking immodest questions, and teach vices vnder pretence of sounding mens consciences, & make enquiry of married mens secrets, whereof also they haue made rules. Reade the 19. booke of *Buchars* Decree, the Roman Penitentiall, *Nauarrus*, *Sanches*, *Emanuel Saes* Aphorismes, and other Casuists, Cardinall *Toletz* Instruction to Priests, and the immodest booke of the Benedictins touching Confessions. There you shall see a thousands secrets of enormous vnchastitie: the shamefull trickes of Couents, and prophane curiosity whereby they teach and reduce vices into an Art, as well naturall as against nature, vnder colour to reproue them.

Of Absolution and sacramentall Satisfaction.

Our Lord Iesus Christ hath giuen power to his Apostles and to their successors to pardon sinnes, and to bind and loose sinners, Mat. 16. 19. and 18. 18. and Ioh. 20. A sinner is bound as long as he is obliged to the punishment due for sinne, and is vnbound, when he is absolued, and that his conscience is discharged of that obligation to the punishment in which he was before bound. 5. Sect.

This power of faithfull Pastors is exercised, not only by the preaching of the Gospell in generall, whereby remission of sinnes is promised to all beleeuers and repentant sinners, and the Iudgement of God pronounced against all incredulous and impenitent persons: but also by Ecclesiasticall discipline, whereby the penitent sinner is admitted and reconciled to the Church, and the impenitent put from the Communion of the faithfull. Which receiuing or reiecting, God declareth to be ratified in heauen, Matth. 18. 18. That is the power of the keyes which God hath put into his seruants hands, who pronounce this pardon, not as Iudges, but as Ministers and Heralds of peace and reconciliation, declaring to the penitent

nitent ſinner that his ſinnes are remitted by the authority which God giueth to the Preachers of his word. There is none (to ſpeak properly) but God, that can abſolutely forgiue ſinnes. It belongs to the partie offended abſolutely to pardon. It is in him to pardon ſinnes that can puniſh ſoules. It is in him to pardon with certaintie, which knoweth the hearts and the interiour repentance of ſinners. Now there is none but God to whom theſe things are proper. In the pardon whereby a Prieſt pardoneth a ſinner for an offence by him committed to God, there are two things to be conſidered; one, that there is no pardon if the ſinner doth not earneſtly repent; the other, that he himſelf which pardoneth hath need of pardon. Of theſe two points, the firſt is the cauſe that the Prieſts pardon is conditionall, becauſe he knoweth not the heart: the other is a cauſe that the Prieſt ſhould conſider of himſelfe, that he is rather a delinquent then a Iudge: and to teach him to feare, leſt that after he hath pardoned others, he himſelfe may not obtaine pardon. It is a thing certaine, that if a ſinner ſeriouſly conuerting and beleeuing in Ieſus Chriſt, cannot obtaine abſolution of his Paſtor, which is paſſionate, or badly informed of the truth, God will pardon him. On the contrary, if a Paſtor that is indulgent, and winketh at vices, or that is deceiued by apparence of repentance, abſolueth an hypocriticall ſinner, and receiueth him into the communion of the faithfull, that hypocriticall ſinner remaineth bound before God, and ſhall be puniſhed notwithſtanding. For God partaketh not with the errors of Paſtors, neither regardeth their paſſions, nor can be hindred from doing iuſtice by their ignorance.

* 1. Cor. 9. 22. 1. Tim. 4. 16. As God in the Scripture ſaith, * That Paſtors ſaue mens ſoules, becauſe God vſeth their miniſtery to ſaue them: ſo Paſtors pardon ſinnes, becauſe God vſeth their miniſterie to pardon them, giuing efficacie to their words pronounced, either to all men publickly, or priuately to ſinners confeſſing their ſinnes, and thereby imprinting an aſſurance of abſolution in ſinners hearts, or thereby aggrauating the condemnation of thoſe which deſpiſe the pardon by them propounded:

ded: this deſpiſing being contrarie to God himſelfe, who in the ſame place where he giueth them power to preach, ſaith, *As my Father ſent me, ſo I ſend you. Whoſe ſinnes, &c.* The places of Scripture where it is ſaid that Paſtors ſaue men, are 1. Corinth. 9. 22. *I am made all things to all men, that I might by all meanes ſaue ſome.* And 1. Tim. 4. 16. *For in doing this, thou ſhalt both ſaue thy ſelfe and them that heare thee. Lombard*, the father of the Romiſh Schoole, ioyneth with vs in his fourth booke, Diſtinct. 28. ſaying, * *The Lord hath giuen power to Prieſts to binde and vnbinde, that is, to ſhew that men are bound or vnbound.*

* *Littera F. Dominus Sacerdotib. tribuit potestatem ſoluendi & ligandi, id eſt, oſtendendi homines eſſe ligatos vel ſolutos.*

The abſolutions of the Church of Rome, (as well abſolution Sacramental, whereby they ſay that the fault of mortall ſinne is remitted, as indulgences or pardons by the which ſatisfactorie penance is remitted and releaſed) are of another nature.

For their Prieſts pardon with authority of iuriſdiction ouer mens ſoules. And the Pope giues abſolutions ſealed with lead, in forme of a iudiciall ſentence in a Court, although he knoweth not the ſinners repentance. He hath reſerued the power to himſelfe to pardon all ſorts of ſinnes: and hath limited the power of Biſhops & Prieſts to certaine caſes. And vnder the ſhadow and pretence that it was ſaid to Saint *Peter, All that which thou ſhalt vnbinde on earth*, he pretends to vnbinde vpon earth, and to draw ſoules out of Purgatory, whereby he reapeth great profit.

And vnder pretence, that in the Scripture there is mention made of vnbinding ſinnes, he taketh vpon him to diſcharge men of their othes, and of the ſubiection and fidelity which they owe to their naturall Princes, and children of the obedience which they owe to their fathers and mothers, whenſoeuer by deſpite or deſpaire they runne into monaſteries, as into a ſanctuary of rebellion. By the ſame power hee diſſolueth marriages lawfully contracted, if he find that they haue both bene Goſſips at the baptizing of an Infant, or are allied by the ſacrament of Confirmation. Which are euident proo's, that the Scripture is alledged by our aduerſaries to vpho'd

this power, more in mockery then for any hope that they haue to be beleeued.

Eman. Sa Aphorism. in verbo Excommunicatio, Absolutio ex causa falsa valet. Tolet. De Instruct. Sacerdot. li. 1. ca. 14. Absolutio iniusta valet. Toletus in bid. Potest absolutio fieri per procuratorem. Homo iniustus potest absolui ignarus & inscius absolutionis. wide Azor. li. cap. 19 q. 2. Eman. Sa in verbo Excommunicatio.

The absolution of Excommunication, although it bee different from that of the sacramentall absolution, yet in regard of the affinity vnto it, deserues a line or two. The abuses therein are enormous.

The Doctors of the Church of Rome teach, that vniust absolution is auaileable. Also in the Church of Rome a man is absolued by a Proctor. And there a sinner is absolued when he knoweth it not, yea and against his will, which is as much as to saue a sinner whether he will or not. I haue seene those that haue caused absolution of their sins to come from Rome by bils of Exchange. The same Doctors say, that an hereticke and an excommunicated person may giue absolution at the houre of death. *Tolet* saith it in his first booke of the Instruction of Priests, Chap. 15. That is to say, that an excommunicated person may administer the Communion, and conferre those graces which he himselfe hath not, and whereof (if he had them) God maketh him no distributer.

Emanuel Sa the Iesuite, in the beginning of his Aphorismes sheweth vs, what words the Priest vseth in giuing absolution. Among other things the Priest saith to the sinner, *The passion of our Lord Iesus Christ, and the merits of the most blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the Saints, and all the good which thou shalt do, and the euill which thou shalt patiently endure, serue thee for remission of thy sinne, and for increase of grace, and for reward of eternall life.* But the Scripture saith, *That the blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne*, 1 Iohn 1. 7. And, *That we are iustified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Iesus Christ*, Romans 3. 24. And *That by him God freely pardoneth all our offences.* Coloss. 2. 14. And *That there is no saluation in any other*, Acts 4. 12. Away then with merits, either of our owne, or borrowed of others, and all trauels and humane perfections whereby men pretend to merit pardon before God. For though in all these workes and labours there were nothing to be disliked, yet they are things which we are bound to do. For he which

oweth

oweth an annuall rent, in paying that yeeres rent, cannot ſatisfie and diſcharge his old debts. Moreouer, to ioyne theſe things with the infinite merit of the Sonne of God, is as if a man ſhould tye a blacke coale to a bracelet or chaine of bright ſhining diamonds, and couple moſt vnequall things together.

To be ſhort, in what place of the Scripture do they finde one word, to proue, that by our merits, or by the merits of other men, we ſhould deſerue pardon of God? That is a new Goſpell, a rule of marchandize ſeruing for trafficke, and a doctrine drawne out of the vnwritten word. The more we ſtirre this matter, the more the abuſe is diſcouered: it is like a common ſincke. The taxe of the Apoſtolicall Chancerie rateth letters of abſolution for euery particular ſinne at a certaine price, without excepting Parricide or inceſt. And alwayes ſinnes committed againſt the Pope, are rated at an higher price then thoſe ſinnes that are directly committed againſt God. This trafficke extendeth it ſelfe euen vnto the dead: For in the 44. leafe of the ſaid Taxe theſe wordes are found: *For a dead man that is excommunicated, for whom his parents are ſuppliants, a letter of abſolution is ſold for a Ducket and nine Carolus.*

Pro mortuo excommunicato pro quo parentes ſupplicant, littera abſolutionis vænit Duc. 1. Car. 9.

And when there is an abſolution to be giuen to an excommunicated King, that is done vpon profitable conditions for the Pope, but preiudiciall and ignominious for the King. Sometimes thoſe poore Kings are condemned to certaine ſtripes in their owne perſons; as *Henry* the ſecond King of England, that was whipt by a number of Monks: or in the perſons of their Ambaſſadors, as *Henry* the fourth of famous memory, our late king deceaſſed, was beaten by Pope *Clement* 8. with diuers blowes with a ſtaffe, in the perſon of Monſieur de *Perron* Biſhop of Eureux his Embaſſador. Or elſe the Pope condemnes them to ſend certaine troupes of ſouldiers to aide his Holineſſe, and to make their kingdomes tributary to the Papall Seate, as he did to *Henry* the ſecond, and to *Iohn* and *Henry* the third, Kings of England. By theſe practices he hath impoueriſhed the Emperours of Germany, and

and brought a puiſſant Empire into a poore eſtate, as we ſee at this day.

Seſſion 14. c. 6. The Councell of Trent maketh this ſacramental abſolution vaine and of no effect; declaring, that notwithſtanding the faith and contrition of a ſinner, yet he ought not to preſume that by this abſolution his ſinnes are truly pardoned, if the Prieſt at that time had not an intent to abſolue him; as oftentimes there are prophane Prieſts, or incredulous, or ſuch as hate thoſe to whom they giue abſolution. Now this intent of the Prieſt is vnknowne, & onely to be preſumed on. They alſo make vaine their abſolution by the ſatisfactory penances which they impoſe on men: for, vnlooſing the ſinner by Abſolution, at the ſame inſtant they bind him againe by the corporall puniſhment which they impoſe vpon him. They pardon him, and in the meane time make him ſubiect to a puniſhment. They pardon the fault, and yet conſtraine him to ſuffer the puniſhment. Ieſus Chriſt did not ſo: for in the 8. of Saint *Iohn*, pardoning the woman taken in adultery, hee onely ſaid vnto her, *Go, and ſinne no more*: without impoſing any ſatisfactorie penance either corporall or pecuniary on her after her abſolution. All the Eccleſiaſticall cenſures which the ancient Church vſed and thereby humbled the ſinner, were made before Abſolution and Reconciliation to the Church. By thoſe exerciſes of Penitence the ſinner ſatisfied the Church, but not Gods Iuſtice, which Ieſus Chriſt hath fully ſatisfied.

Yet this is not all: for our Aduerſaries hauing impoſed ſatisfactorie puniſhments vpon a ſinner, preſently after they diſpence with him for money, and change corporall into pecuniary puniſhments, as we haue ſhewed in the 38. Section of the firſt booke. *Bellarmine* in the 13. Chap. of his 4. booke of Penitence ſaith, that the Pope by his pardons diſchargeth vs from the obedience of the commandement of God, which ſaith, *Do workes worthy of repentance*. That is to preferre the Pope before God.

Indulgentiæ faciunt vt pro pœnis quæ per

You muſt alſo note, that the Councell of Trent will not onely haue thoſe ſatisfactions to ſerue to amend the ſinner, but

but alſo to take vengeance of ſinnes pardoned. A doctrine which contradicteth it ſelfe: for God taketh no vengeance after he hath pardoned.

indulgentiæ condonentur, non tenemur præcepto illo de faciendis dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus.

Touching caſes wherein a Prieſt cannot abſolue, but are reſerued to the Biſhop, whoſe power alſo is limited, many caſes being reſerued onely to the Pope himſelfe, the Councell of Trent in the 14. Seſſion, groundeth thoſe reſeruations vpon Romans 13. 1. noted in the margent of the ſaid Councell, where Saint *Paul* ſaith, *Quæ à Deo ſunt, ordinata ſunt: Thoſe things that are of God, are ordained or ſet downe in order.* From whence he inferreth, that ſuperior powers ought to reſerue ſome things to themſelues aboue inferior perſons. But this place is falſified both in ſence and words: firſt in the ſence; for this place of Saint *Paul* ſpeaketh of ciuill Magiſtrates which beare the ſword, and not of Paſtors of the Church, nor of powers ſet in rancke and order, but ordained and eſtabliſhed by God. Secondly, In the words, for according to the Greeke originall it is, *The powers that be, are eſtabliſhed or ordained of God*: and ſo the French Bible tranſlated by the Doctors of Louain hath it. With ſuch quotations the margent of that Councell is filled.

αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ἐξουσίαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν.

Thoſe Prelates quoted not Matth. 18. 18. nor Iohn 20. 23. where Ieſus Chriſt giueth all his diſciples equall power to pardon all manner of ſinnes, without reſeruing any caſes to Saint *Peter*, ſaying, *Whatſoeuer ye bind on earth, ſhall be bound in heauen; and whatſoeuer ye looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heauen.*

Of the pretended Sacrament of Marriage.

6. Seſſ.

Our aduerſaries call the Marriage of Prieſts and Clergie men, ſacriledge, & yet call the Marriage of lay men, a Sacrament which conferreth iuſtifying grace. By this deuice the Prelates haue drawne the knowledge of matrimoniall cauſes to themſelues, becauſe it belongeth to the Church to iudge of Sacraments. It is not to be vttered what great profit

profit they reape thereby, and how many persons come to Rome for matrimoniall causes. The same anarice which forbade Marriage to Priests, thereby to preserue the goods of the Church, hath made Marriage a Sacrament, thereby to take the knowledge of matrimoniall causes from the Magistrate. The truth herein is so manifest, that vntruth finds no place wherein to hide it selfe. For our aduersaries say, that a Sacrament is a sacred signe instituted by Iesus Christ, proper to the Christian Church, whereby iustifying grace is conferred to those which receiue it. But nothing of all this agreeth with Marriage.

1 Euery Sacrament of the Christian Church was instituted by Iesus Christ. But Marriage was not instituted by Iesus Christ: for Marriage was vsed in the world before Iesus Christ was borne. If they answer, and say, that Iesus Christ changed the nature, or the vse, or the significatiō of Marriage, and that he ordained, that from thence-forward Marriage should be a Sacrament, then they must produce that ordinance of Iesus Christ. Which they could neuer yet do: it is a thing drawne from the vnwritten word.

2 Sacraments are remedies against sinne, and aides to our infirmities: Marriage therefore is no Sacrament, because it was ordained before sinne entred into the world, and then when there was no infirmity in man.

3 The Sacraments of the Christian Church are not vsed among Pagans. Marriage therefore is no Sacrament of the Christian Chuch, because it is vsed among Pagans, whose marriages are lawfull, as the Apostle teacheth vs, 1. Cor. 7. 13. For, counselling a beleeuing wife not to leaue or forsake her husband that is an infidell, he presupposeth that their marriage is lawfull, although it was before the conuersion of the wife vnto the faith. * Whereupon *Ambrose* noteth, that *Iohn Baptist* would not haue said to *Herod*, It is not lawfull for thee to haue thy brothers wife, if there had bene no marriage among infidels. And if a man and a woman that are infidels become Christians, shall their Marriage which was not a Sacrament, become a Sacrament? Or if that be absurd, and

* *Dist. 16 Can. Vna. Tantum ex Ambrosio. Ioannes Baptista dum Herodem ab incestu prohiberet, dicens, Non licet tibi habere vxorem fratris tui, euidenter ostendit inter infideles coniugia esse.*

and that their Marriage is not a Sacrament after their conuerſion, ſhall there be Chriſtians whoſe Marriages are lawfull, and yet it is no Sacrament?

4 The Church of Rome in effect acknowledgeth that Marriage is no Sacrament, by this, that Marriages are there permitted to be made by a Proctor. For the Sacraments are not adminiſtred by Proctors. To baptize a man for another man, and after a man hath for himſelfe bene participant of the holy Supper, to participate the ſame againe for another man, is as much as to make a play of Chriſtian religion.

5 In all Sacraments the word muſt be ioyned with the element, that it may be a Sacrament: but here there is no element: for neither the words nor the actions are elements.

6 And when a Prieſt (not knowing it) hath married two perſons together, whereof one is defective and incapable of marriage, either he hath truly conferred a Sacrament, or he hath not conferred a Sacrament. If he hath not conferred a Sacrament, then marriage is a Sacrament which dependeth vpon the integrity of the body of thoſe which receiue it: and an action which to a man that is entire & ſound is a Sacrament, but to a man that is defective, is no Sacrament. And ſo it ſhall fall out, that the Prieſt doth that which he thought not to do, and thinking to adminiſter a Sacrament, he adminiſtreth nothing. But if thoſe perſons haue receiued a Sacrament, what is it when the marriage within ſhort time after is diſſolued, by complaint made by one of the parties? That were an vndoing & defacing of a Sacrament, as if Baptiſme ſhould be fruſtrated, or the Lords Supper diſanulled, being receiued by a man that is ill diſpoſed.

7 Adde hereunto, that the Church of Rome holdeth, that Sacraments conferre iuſtifying grace, *ex opere operato*, that is to ſay, by the bare action, without the neceſſarie vertue and holineſſe of him that conferreth it, or the attention of him which receiueth it. Let them ſhew me then what this bare action in Marriage is which conferreth iuſtifying grace. Is a man regenerated by ſolemnizatiō of Marriage in the Church? If it be ſo, how commeth it to paſſe, that a man then becom-

meth.

meth more licentious in superfluity of apparell, banketts, dancing, &c. Is that the iustifying grace which thereby is conferred?

8 If they will that Marriage since the institution made by Iesus Christ, doth conferre iustifying grace, then they must produce the promise made by the Sonne of God, which promiseth this iustifying grace to those that are married. This puts our aduersaries to a non-plus, and they are faine to send vs to the vnwritten Word.

9 By the Apostles counsell, 1. Cor. 7. 37. one that is continent, and not tempted with euill desires, doth wisely not to marrie. Which should be false, if Marriage were a Sacrament conferring grace. For is it a commendable thing to abstaine from a Sacrament which conferreth grace and iustifieth?

10 But why should the Marriage of Patriarkes and Prophets be no Sacrament, and the Marriage of a vicious Christian, which marrieth disorderly, and against the will of his parents, be a Sacrament? What more holy or more mysticall thing is there at this day in the Marriage of Christians, then was in the marriage of the Prophets and Apostles? For if at this day Marriage be called a Sacrament, because it is a figure of the vnion of the Church with Iesus Christ, it signified the same in the old Testament, where that spirituall vnion is oftentimes represented vnder the figure of Marriage: as we see in the 45. Psalme, the Song of *Salomon*, the 16. of *Ezechiel*, and the first and second Chapters of *Osee*. And if euer any Marriage was sacred and full of mysterie, it was the Marriage of *Adam* and *Eue*. For as God vsed the casting of *Adam* into a profound sleepe, in the meane time to forme a wife for him, so God vsed the sleepe of the death of the second *Adam*, to get him a wife, that is, the Church. Or if the Marriage of Christians be esteemed to be a Sacrament, because it is indissoluble, how doth the Church of Rome separate Marriages, onely because the parties married did both together present a child at Baptisme, or at Confirmation? Adde hereunto, that the inseparability doth not make a thing to be a Sacrament. If that were so, faith and repen-

repentance ſhould be Sacraments, becauſe they are inſeparable. And it is not found that the Marriages of Chriſtians are more indiſſoluble then the Marriage of *Adam* with *Eua*, or of *Abraham* and *Sara*. And when Ieſus Chriſt, Mat. 19. 8. would aboliſh the liberty of diuorces vſed among the Iewes, and would reſtore marriage indiſſoluble, except it be in caſe of adultery, he reduceth them to the firſt inſtitution, and ſaith, *In the beginning it was not ſo.*

11 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, Rom. 4. 11. calleth circumciſion, *The ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of faith*, ſhewing thereby, that Sacraments ſerue not onely to ſignifie ſome graces of God, but alſo to ratifie the ſame vnto vs, and to confirme the promiſes of God in vs. If then they will haue Marriage to be a Sacrament, it muſt not onely be a figure of the vnion of Ieſus Chriſt with his Church, but alſo it muſt ſeale and confirme vnto vs ſome particular promiſe of God which is found in his Word. But here they are ſilent, and ſay nothing that is any thing likely.

12 The Sacraments are tyed together by a naturall bond, one hindreth not the vſe of another: but the Church of Rome hath forged two diſcordant Sacraments, whereof the one impeacheth the vſe of the other, that is, the Sacrament of Orders, by the which a man being made a Prieſt, becommeth incapable to receiue the Sacrament of Marriage, and then that Sacrament of Marriage becommeth ſacriledge and an abomination vnto him. There are Eccleſiaſticall functions, whereof the one hinderth the other, as ſeruing the tables, & preaching of the Word, Act. 6. 2. becauſe of humane infirmitie, which cannot attend diuers things at once. But it ſhall neuer bee found, that a thing which is holy and ſacred to ſome men, is prophane and abominable to others, and that the ſame which is a Sacrament to one man, is ſacriledge and abomination to another.

13 And to conclude, this error doth wrap and intangle it ſelfe ſo many wayes, that this pretended Sacrament is a Sacrament which men muſt diuine and preſume of: in ſuch manner, that in the Church of Rome no man can aſſure himſelfe

ſelfe that he is married, although he hath had a dozen chil-
Seſſ. 7. ca. 11. dren by his wife. For the Councell of Trent pronounceth ex-communication and a curſe againſt all thoſe which ſhall ſay, that the intent of the Miniſter in conferring a Sacrament, is not neceſſary. It is a doctrine generally receiued in the Church of Rome, that if he which baptizeth, or marrieth, or ſingeth Maſſe, hath not an intent to do that which the Church ordaineth, or hath not an intent to celebrate a Sacrament, Baptiſme and Marriage ſolemnized by him are nothing, and neither Conſecration nor Tranſſubſtantiation is made. Now this intent muſt be diuined or preſumed vpon. Wherein nevertheleſſe there is matter and ſubiect enough to doubt of: for the Church of Rome is full of Prieſts which acknowledge and deteſt the abuſes of the Church of Rome, & which condemne their owne actions: without ſpeaking of Atheiſts whereof the world is ful, who in their hearts laugh & mocke at all that which is done in the Church.

Dur. in Sent. l. 4. Diſt. 26. q. 3. 14 For theſe cauſes or the like, *Durand* is of opinion, that to ſpeake properly, Marriage is not a Sacrament. And which is more, Pope *Leo* the 1 in his 90. Epiſtle to *Ruſticus* Biſhop of Narbon ſaith: *Quod ſocietas nuptiarum ab initio conſtituta eſt, vt præter ſexuum conuunctionem, haberet in ſe Chriſti & Eccleſiæ Sacramentum*: That the ſocietie of Marriage was eſtabliſhed from the beginning, that beſides the conunction of ſexes, it might be a Sacrament of Chriſt and his Church. This Biſhop ſaith, that Marriage hath bene a Sacrament of Chriſt and the Church, *ab initio*, from the beginning, and not onely ſince the comming of Ieſus Chriſt.

To be ſhort, if we ſhould ſay nothing, the thing it ſelfe would ſpeake: for Marriage hath bene made infamous and abominable to Prieſts for the preſeruation of Eccleſiaſticall goods, leſt they ſhould take vpon them to withdraw ſome part thereof from the Church for the benefit of their children, as Pope *Gregory* the 1. in the 28. Diſtinction, in the Canon *De Syracuſana*, ſaith. But where it was profitable for the Clergie to exalt Marriage, Popes haue found meanes to aduance it ſo farre, as to make it a Sacrament, conferring iuſti-

Vxor ſuperſtes & filij per quos Eccleſiaſtica ſolet peruenire ubſtantia.

fying

fying grace, to draw the knowledge of matrimoniall causes to themselues.

Which appeareth by the dispensations and other practices whereby in this matter the Pope exalteth himselfe aboue God. For the Councell of Trent in the 24. Session pronounceth all those to be accursed, which say, that the Church cannot dispence with the degrees of consanguinitie prohibited by the word of God in Leuiticus. And that men may know that in those dispensations the Pope is ruled by humane respects and worldly considerations. In the same Councell and the same Session, can. 5. * prohibition is made, *not to dispence with the second degree, but onely betweene great Princes, and for publike causes.* If marriage in the second degree be permitted by the word of God, why doth the Pope prohibit it? If it be prohibited by the word of God, why doth the Pope dispence with Princes for the same? Haue Princes the priuiledge to offend God?

The same cunning also appeareth herein, that the Pope hath inuented degrees of imaginarie kindreds betweene Godfathers & Godmothers, which may not marrie without dispensation, and by a great priuiledge. He hath extended the prohibition of marriage to the fourth degree of affinitie, but he dispenceth therewith euen to the first degree of affinitie, alway paying for it. The taxe of the Romane Chancerie imprinted at Paris with priuiledge and approbation, in the 40. leafe hath these words: *The Penitentiary may dispence with the first degree of affinitie at the barre of conscience, and the bill is sold for 9. duckats and sixe groates.* That is, that the Pope may giue permission to a man to marrie the sister of the wife deceased, against the expresse prohibition thereof made Leuit. 18. 16. and 20. 21. *Innocent* the third did it, as *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth in the 28. chapter of his Booke of Marriage. The Almaine Doctor in the 12. chapter of his booke of Spirituall and temporall power hath these words, saying, * *Martin the fifth with ripe deliberation granted a dispen'ation betweene*

Can. 3 Si quis dixerit eos tantum consanguinitatis & affinitatis gradus qui Leuitico exprimuntur, posse impedire matrimonium contrahendum & dirimere contractum, nec posse Ecclesiam in nonnullis illorum dispensare, aut constituere vt plures impediant & dirimant, Anathema sit.

* *In secundo gradu nunquam dispensetur nisi inter magnos Principes & ob publicam causam.*

An. 1520. By Tonsslains Denis, rue S. Iacques pres S. Iues. *Item etiam dispensare potest penitentiaria, in primo gradu affinitatis in foro conscientiæ: & littera venit duc. 9. gr. 6*

* *Martinus quintus consilio maturo habito, dispensauit inter aliquos in secundo gradu consanguinitatis qui est lege diuina prohibitus. Similiter temporibus nostris Papa dispensauit cum aliquo quod haberet duas sorores vnam post alteram contra legem Dei.*

certaine persons in the second degree of consanguinitie, which is prohibited in the diuine Law. Likewise in our time the Pope gaue a dispensation to a certaine man to marrie two sisters one after the other, contrary to the Law of God, &c. Whereupon this Doctor produceth the authoritie of *Panormitanus* and *Angelus*, who maintaine that the Pope may dispence against the Law of God.

To make Marriage a Sacrament, our aduersaries produce Ephesians 5. 32. which in the vulgar translation is thus set downe, *The Sacrament is great, but I say in Iesus Christ and the Church.* But in the Greeke it is thus, *This is a great secret or a mysterie, but I speake concerning Christ, and concerning the Church.* In this place the Apostle speaketh of the sacred vnion betweene Iesus Christ and his Church: which vnion he compareth to corporall Marriage betweene the husband and the wife. His intent was not to exalt the mysterie of Marriage, but the vnion of the Church with Iesus Christ. This mysterie then whereof he speaketh, is the mysticall vnion betweene Iesus Christ and the Church, and not the vnion betweene the husband and the wife. For hauing said, *This is a great mysterie*, that we should not thinke that he speakes of the mysterie which is in Marriage, he addeth, *But I speake touching Iesus Christ and his Church.*

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Hauing regard to Iesus Christ and to his Church.

But be it so, that Saint *Paul* calleth Marriage a mysterie or secret: and that the vulgar translation hath truly translated *Mysterie* by the word *Sacrament*, what is that to proue Marriage to be a Sacrament of the Church? Will our aduersaries haue all those things which in the vulgar translation are called Sacraments, to be Sacraments of the Church of Rome? By that reckoning the great whore shall be a Sacrament of the Romish Church: for in Apocalyps 17. 7. according to the vulgar translation, it is said, *I will shew thee the Sacrament of that woman, and of that beast that beareth her.* And the seuen starres in Apocalyps 1. 20. should be a Sacrament, for in the vulgar translation they are called so. And three times in Dan. 2. in the same translation dreames & visions are called Sacraments. And in 1. Tim. 3. 16. Pietie is called a great Sacra-

Sacrament, in ſtead of a ſecret or myſterie. But moſt of all the fraud of this tranſlation appeareth herein, that in the chapter following, verſe 19. Saint *Paul* prayeth the Epheſians *to pray for him, that vtterance might be giuen vnto him to open his mouth boldly to publiſh μυστηριον, the myſterie or ſecret of the Goſpell.* In this the vnlgar tranſlation, ſaith, *Myſterium Euangelij*, and not *Sacramentum Euangelij*. Here are two places one neere vnto the other in one Epiſtle, where one ſelfeſame Greek word in one place is tranſlated *myſterie*, and in another, *Sacrament*. Let them tranſlate theſe two places both alike, and the difficultie is ended. Cardinall *Caietan* acknowledged the ſame in his Commentary vpon this place, where he ſaith, *Prudent Reader, thou learneſt not here of Saint Paul, that Marriage is a Sacrament: for he ſaith not, this Sacrament, but this myſterie is great, and in truth the myſterie of thoſe words is great.* I confeſſe that Marriage is a figure of the vniō of Ieſus Chriſt and his Church: but by the ſame reaſon, the vnion of the head with the members, and the ſtocke of a vine with the twigs and branches thereof ſhould be Sacraments. Adde hereunto, that Marriage prefigured the ſame in the old Teſtament whē Marriage was no Sacrament, if we beleeue our aduerſaries. This might ſerue for an anſwer to the words which *M. Arnoux* addeth.

Non habes ex hoc loco, prudens lector, à Paulo coniugium eſſe Sacramentum. Non enim dicit Sacramentum, ſed myſterium hoc magnum eſt. Et verè myſterium verborum horum magnum eſt.

ARNOVX.

Epheſians 5. 32. ſpeaking of Marriage. This Sacrament is great, I ſay in Chriſt and his Church. Then why do they receiue but two Sacraments onely, ſeeing the Apoſtle cals Marriage a Sacrament, and a great Sacrament? But they perceiuing that this place ouerthroweth their doctrine, they haue corrupted the place, putting the word ſecret, in ſtead of Sacrament, leauing the Greeke original, and the Latine tranſlation. 7. Sect.

MOVLIN.

This hath already beene confuted. This man ſheweth that he vnderſtandeth not the Greeke, and that he hath badly read ouer the Bible. In the Greeke, it is *myſterie*, and in the Latine Bible it is tranſlated ſo in the chapter following, verſe nineteene.

Of extreme Vnction.

Extreme Vnction is a Sacrament of the Church of Rome, wherein the Prieſt annointeth the eyes, eares, noſe, mouth, hands and feete of the ſicke perſon with conſecrated oyle, making the ſigne of the croſſe with his thombe dipt in oyle, and beſeecheth God to pardon the ſicke perſon all the ſinnes which he committed by thoſe parts of his body. Then he turneth the ſicke perſon about, and annointeth his reines, becauſe in them is the ſeate of the ſinne of lecherie. That done, hee waſheth his hands with water and ſalt, and caſteth the water into the chimney.

All this is done after the reading of the Letanie, wherein ſome fiftie Saints are named and called vpon, and with diuers prayers which craue of God health and remiſſion of ſinnes for the ſicke perſon.

This Sacrament is adminiſtred to none but to ſicke perſons which are in danger of death. It is not permitted to be adminiſtred to thoſe that go to be hanged, or which go to place a petard vnder a gate, or which enter into a dangerous combat, or which go a long voyage by Sea.

Catechaſis Tridentina cap. de Extrema Vnctione.

The Catechiſme of the Councell of Trent ſaith, that this Sacrament ſerueth to deface and blot out ſmall and veniall ſinnes: for touching mortall ſinnes, penitentiall abſolution hath defaced them before. The Councell of Trent in the 14. Seſſion ſaith, that by this Sacrament the reſt of mens ſins are cleanſed.

To ground this pretended Sacrament, they produce two places of the Scripture, the firſt is, Marke 6. 13. where it is ſaid, that the Apoſtles *Caſt out many diuels, and annointed many that were ſicke with oyle, and healed them.* The ſecond is, Iames 5. 14, 15. where it is ſaid, *Is any ſicke among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray for him, and annoint him with oyle in the name of the Lord: And the prayer of faith*

faith ſhall ſaue the ſicke, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him vp. If he hath committed ſinnes, they ſhall be forgiuen him.

In the expoſition of ſome places, our Aduerſaries are diuided iuto contrary opinions, and their contention is great. Some of them, as *Thomas Waldenſis*, *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, and *Maldonat* in his Commentarie vpon Saint *Marke*, are of opinion, that in he ſixt of Saint Marke there is nothing ſpoken of extreme Vnction; and that both Saint *Marke* and Saint *Iames* ſpeake of ſacramentall Vnction.

Alphonſ. de Caſtro l. br. de Hæreſib. verbo Extrema Vnctio.

Cardinall *Bellarmine* on the contrarie denieth, that the Vnction ſpoken of in Saint *Marke* is the ſame that is ſpoken of in Saint *Iames*, and is not of opinion that that whereof Saint *Marke* ſpeaketh, is the Sacrament of extreme Vnction.

Lib de extrema Vnctione cap 2.

Cardinall *Caietan* is of another opinion: for he formally denieth that Saint *Iames* ſpeaketh of ſacramentall Vnction, and beleeueth not that vpon that place extreme Vnction can be grounded, ſaying: *Theſe words of S. Iames ſpeake not of the ſacramentall Vnction of extreme Vnction, whether we conſider the words or the effects thereof, but rather of the Vnction which the Lord Ieſus ordained in the Goſpell, to be vſed by his Diſciples to the ſicke. For the Text ſaith not, Is any ſicke to death? but abſolutely, Is any ſicke? and ſaith, that the effect of that Vnction is the eaſing of the ſicke perſon.*

Nec ex verbis, nec ex effectis verba hæc loquuntur de ſacramentali Vnctione extremæ Vnctionis, ſed magis de Vnctione quam inſtituit Dominus Ieſus in Euangelio à diſcipulis exercendum in ægrotos. Vide Sixtus Senenſis Biblioth libr. 6. Annot. 399.

Among theſe mixtures of opinions, the Councell of Trent takes a new way, ſaying in the 14. Seſſion, that in the ſixt of Saint *Marke* Ieſus Chriſt inſinuateth the Sacrament of extreme Vnction. And the Catechiſme of the Councell of Trent ſaith, that *our Sauiour gaueth a patterne thereof, and a beginning or an entrance.* It is the manner of this Councell when it findeth any thing againſt it, to vſe ambiguous and wreſted words, which euery man may interpret for his owne aduantage.

All this difference and contention may be drawne to theſe two heads.

1 The firſt is, whether this ceremony of anointing the ſicke ought to be perpetually in the Church?

2 The ſecond, whether this Vnction practiſed in the time of the Apoſtles, is one of the Sacraments of the Chriſtian Church?

First point. 1 The firſt queſtion is cleered, becauſe theſe two places, one the ſixt of Saint *Marke*, the other, the fift of Saint *Iames*, ſay, that this Vnction ſerued for the healing of the ſicke. *They anointed diuers ſicke perſons with oyle, and healed them*, Marke 6. *Let them aneint the ſicke perſon with oyle in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith ſhall ſaue the ſicke, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him vp.* Whereby it appeareth, that while the gifts of healing, and this vertue of miraculous reſtoring of health, were in the Church, it was expedient to obſerue that Vnction, as an exterior ſigne of the vertue of God, wherunto God gaue efficacie. But ſince that vertue ceaſed, there is no more reaſon to obſerue that ceremony, then if a blind man ſhould ſtill vſe ſpectacles, or if one ſhould vſe to combe himſelfe when all his haire is fallen off and gone. Interior vertue ceaſing, exterior obſeruation ought to ceaſe. God himſelfe giueth vs an example thereof, in this, that he tooke the tree of life from *Adam*, when by ſinne he fell into death. Not that life depended vpon that tree, but becauſe God will not haue vnprofitable ſignes.

ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος.

2 Hereby it appeareth, that Saint *Iames* ſpeaketh not of extreme Vnction, ſeeing he ſpeaketh of an Vnction whereby a man is reſtored to health. The Vnction is extreme which is giuen at the extremity, but this Vnction is giuen to thoſe which are to liue ſtill, and that being reſtored to health, might in the ſame neceſſitie make vſe of the ſame remedy againe.

3 Adde hereunto, that Saint *Iames* ſpeaketh not of oyle conſecrated by a Biſhop, nor of oyle kept in the Church; for the Apoſtles in that healing vſed ſuch oyle indifferently as was at hand. Neither doth he ſpeake of that heape of ceremonies vſed at this day in the Church of Rome. And as the Apoſtles anointed all thoſe with oyle indifferently which were brought vnto them: Saint *Iames* alſo makes no diſtinction of perſons. But the Church of Rome giueth extreme

Vnction

Vnction to none but to thoſe that aree baptized, and which haue receiued the Sacraments of the Euchariſt and of Penance, and which are not by iuſtice condemned to die.

4 The commandement then of Saint *Iames* ought yet at this day to be practiſed touching the prayer of faith made by Prieſts or Miniſters, to the which remiſſion of ſinnes is promiſed, but not touching corporall anointing, which was vſed for healing. So the Chriſtians of the firſt ages vſed it. *Tertullian* againſt *Scapula*, chap. 4. ſaith, that the Emperour *Seuerus*, [a] vntill he died, kept *Proculus* a Chriſtian in his houſe, which had healed him of a diſeaſe by anointing him with oyle. And *Sulpitius* [b] in the life of *Martin*, ſaith, that *Martin* healed a maide of the palſey, by powring oyle into her mouth. We haue a like example in the Hiſtorie of [c] *Gregory* of Tours, lib. 1. cap. 46. *Caſſander*, in the 22. Article of his Conſultation, reciteth the forme of the ancient anointing of the ſicke, which is worthy here to be ſet downe. *In times paſt* (ſaith he) *the ſicke perſon was anointed with oyle which was called Oyle for ſicke perſons, or for lunaticke perſons, or ſuch as were poſſeſſed with euill ſpirits, in all their members, but ſpecially in that member or place where his paine was, and then they added this forme of prayer: I anoint thee with ſacred oyle, in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghoſt, beſeeching the mercy of God, our onely Lord and God, that all the paines and griefes of thy body being driuen away, thou maiſt recouer thy ſtrength and thy health, in ſuch manner, that being healed by the operation of this myſterie, and by the Vnction of this ſacred oyle, and by our prayer, thou maiſt receiue thy firſt and ſtrongeſt health, by the power of our Lord.* Words which teſtifie, that the principall end of this Vnction was the healing of the body. [d] To the ſame end are the moſt part of the prayers which the Prieſt ſaith ouer the ſicke, ſpecially that wherein he prayeth, that the ſicke perſon may be healed by that medicine.

5 That which Saint *Iames* addeth, is nothing repugnant thereunto, when he ſaith, *If he haue committed ſinnes, they ſhall be forgiuen him.* For thoſe words are as much in effect, as

a *Seuerus Proculum Chriſtianum, qui Toparchion cognominabatur Euhodiæ procuratorum, qui cum per oleum curaretur requiſiuit.*

b *Aegram intuens dari ſibi oleum poſtulat, quod cum benedixiſſet, in os puellæ vim ſanctæ liquoris infudit.*

c *Hic à ſancto Nepotiano viſitatus & ſancto oleo perunctus, reddituſ ſanitati.*

d *Deus qui ſeruulo tuo Ezechiæ ter quinos annos ad vitam donaſti, ita & hunc famulum tuum à lecto ægritudinis erigat ad ſalutem. Reſpice domine famulum tuum in infirmitate corporis laborantem, vt caſtigationibus tuis emundatus, continuo ſentiat tua medicina ſalutem.*

if he had ſaid, that *health ſhall be reſtored vnto him, thoſe ſinnes for the which God hath afflicted him being pardoned.* Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe teacheth vs that, Matth. 9. 5. where he ſaith, that to ſay vnto the ſicke perſon, *Thy ſinnes are forgiuen thee*, and to ſay, *Take vp thy bed and walke*, are all one in effect. For, the cauſe of the euill being taken away, by neceſſity the euill ceaſeth. Saint *Iames* therefore in that place followeth the words of his Maſter. Beſides, he attributeth not the remiſſion of ſinnes to the vertue of the oyle, but to prayer made in faith, ſaying, *The prayer of faith ſhall ſaue the ſicke, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him vp; if he hath committed ſinnes, they ſhall be forgiuen him.*

6 Thereupon our aduerſaries aske vs, why S. *Iames* in that place ſpeaketh of ſicke perſons, and not of deafe and blind men? But this is not to diſpute againſt vs, but to demand of Saint *Iames* a reaſon of his ſpeech. It may be that the Apoſtle by one kind of corporall infirmity did alſo vnderſtand others: & it may alſo be, that Vnction was vſed to none but to thoſe that lay ſicke in their beds, and that they vſed not that kind of remedy for deafe, blind and impotent perſons, as we may ſee of the lame perſon ſpoken of, Acts 3. 2.

It is to no purpoſe to obiect, that many alſo beſides Prieſts had the gift of healing; and that therefore it was not needfull to call them to performe this anointing to heale the ſicke. For then God more commonly conferred thoſe gifts vpon Paſtors, and in a greater meaſure then vpon others, to authorize their preaching.

It is alſo to no purpoſe to ſay, that if as often as Prieſts anointed the ſicke, they were healed, no man would haue died in thoſe times: for many had no deſire to call them, and many had not the meanes nor the leiſure. And Saint *Iames* did not promiſe that they ſhould heale all without exception. For in the ninth of Saint Marke, the Apoſtles could not heale a man poſſeſt with a diuell. And it is not vnlikely, but that whē God reuealed to an Apoſtle that the time of the ſicke parties death approched, the ſame Apoſtle abſtained from vſing of that remedie which he knew would not preuaile.

Now

Now for the ſecond point, which is to know whether the Vnction which the Apoſtles and their Diſciples vſed, may be called a Sacrament? The ſecond point. Whether extreme Vnction be a Sacrament?

Touching that, I ſay, If we take the word Sacrament in the ſame ſence which the ancient Fathers and Romiſh Bible ordinarily take it, that is, for a myſterie, or for a ſacred ſigne, nothing hindereth but that we may call this Vnction a Sacrament, ſeeing it was a ſacred ſigne of the grace and aſſiſtance of God.

But this Vnction cannot be called a Sacrament in the ſame ſence that Baptiſme and the Lords Supper are called Sacraments, that is, ſacred ſignes and ſeales of the Couenant made by God in Ieſus Chriſt, inſtituted by Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe; I ſay, that in this ſence the Vnction whereof Saint *Iames* ſpeaket, he cannot be called a Sacrament.

1 For Sacraments taken in this ſence, are inſtituted for the health of the ſoule, but that Vnction ſpecially and principally ſerued for the health of the body.

2 Not onely the practice of Sacraments (as of Baptiſme and of the Lords Supper) but alſo the inſtitution of them by Ieſus Chriſt, are found in the Goſpell. But none of the Euangeliſts do recite the inſtitution of this Sacrament, neither where, when, nor how Ieſus Chriſt did inſtitute it. Onely we ſee a practice of this Vnction by healing of the ſicke, which of a miraculous medicine is changed into an ordinary Sacrament, laden with a thouſand ceremonies after the cuſtome and manner of ſuperſtition, which is, to multiply ceremonies after the vertue is loſt. I do not deny that this Vnction was commanded by Ieſus Chriſt: for it is not credible that the Apoſtles did any thing without his commandement. But euery thing which Ieſus Chriſt commanded his Apoſtles to do, is not a Sacrament. He commanded his Apoſtles to do many things which were perſonall to themſelues, and which ought not to be perpetuall: as when he commanded them to go and preach the Goſpell, without mony, and without prouiſion for themſelues. And if this Vnction were a perpetuall Sacrament, the Euangeliſts would carefully haue recited the inſtitution,

ſtitution, and the commandement for the perpetuall obſeruing thereof in the Church.

3 The Sacraments of the Chriſtian Church ought to be adminiſtred in the Church: but this extreme Vnction is neuer adminiſtred but in particular mens houſes.

4 The fruite & vſe of this extreme Vnction witneſſeth that it is no Sacrament. For the Councell of Trent in the 7. Seſſion, in the 6. and 7. Canon, ſaith, That Sacraments containe the grace which they conferre, and that they conferre the ſame to thoſe which duly receiue them. Therefore the ſacramentall words of other Sacraments are conceiued at the preſent time when they are conferred, as in Confirmation, *Signote ſigno crucis, & confirmo te Chriſmate ſalutis*, I marke thee with the ſigne of the croſſe, and confirme thee with the Chriſme of ſaluation. And in Baptiſme, *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, &c.* and ſo in all the reſt. There is none but this Sacrament onely which doth not conferre grace, but onely maketh a requeſt: which ſaith not, *I heale thee*, *or I abſolue thee*, but onely asketh health and remiſſion of ſinnes. Then if it be a Sacrament, it muſt be an optatiue Sacrament, and not a Sacrament conferring the grace of God, an irregular Sacrament, which by his ſignes doth not repreſent graces but deſires. For our aduerſaries might well perceiue, that if they had ſaid, *I heale thee*, they had bene confuted by experience; becauſe very few ſicke perſons eſcaped death after extreme Vnction, which was carried to none but to thoſe that were at the point of death, as if that Sacrament ſerued onely to end life, and not to prolong it. They might alſo conſider, that if they ſay, *I ſo giue thee thy ſins*, this Sacrament ſhould vſurpe vpon the Sacrament of Penance.

5 In the meane time by this manner of optatiue ſpeaking, they imprint a ſcruple in mens minds: for ſeeing that of two things which the Prieſt requireth of God, that is, healing of the ſicke perſon, and remiſſion of ſins, it appeareth that God doth not heare him in the one: how then ſhall we be aſſured that God heareth him in the other? ſeeing that the place of Saint *Iames* whereupon they partly ground this Sacrament,

equally

equally promiſeth health and remiſsion of ſinnes?

6 Laſtly, ſeeing that before this Sacrament the ſicke perſon hath receiued abſolution by the which all his ſinnes are remitted, what ſinnes are they which ſtill remaine to be remitted by this extreme Vnction? If by the Sacrament of Penance mortall ſinnes are remitted? why ſhould not the ſame Sacrament remit ſmall and veniall ſinnes? Why ſhould not that which effecteth the greater, effect the leſſer? Thereby it manifeſtly appeareth, that this Sacrament is vnprofitable, and is like a plaiſter laid vpon a wound that is whole, and which ſerueth to aske remiſsion of ſinnes, which are ſaid to be pardoned before.

7 Now that this Sacrament is new, and vnknowne in the ancient Church, it appeareth by this, that there is no trace or ſigne thereof in all Antiquitie. For the Canons of the Councell of Nice tranſlated out of the Arabian tongue, are an inuention of *Turrian* the Ieſuite: to whom if any credit may be giuen, none before him euer knew what the Canons of that ſo famous a Coūcell were. *Innocent* the firſt which wrote in anno 407. or 408. ſpeaketh of this vnction, but calls it not a Sacrament. And euery man knowes how much all thoſe Decretals are ſuſpected of falſehood, and to be of ſmall authoritie. *Bellarmine* ſetteth downe a place of *Chryſoſtome* in the 3. booke of Prieſts; but ſuch as placeth not this Vnction among the Sacraments. The places of Saint *Auguſtine* which he produceth, are drawne out of the Sermons *De tempore*, and out of the booke of the Gloſſe, and out of the booke of the Viſitation of the ſicke, which are ſuſpected bookes. The oldeſt witneſſe that ſpeaketh, is the eleuenth Councell of Chaalons vpon Soame, holden 800. yeeres after the birth of Ieſus Chriſt; and yet was but a particular Synode. Notwithſtanding which Councell, the Canoniſt Doctors which haue written Gloſſes vpon the Decretals, are of opinion that extreme Vnction is not a Sacrament. *What letteth* (ſay they) *that it ſhould be reiterated, ſeeing it is no Sacrament?*

Tit. 21. De ſecundis nuptiis, cap. Vir autem. In Gloſſa. Quid enim impediret hanc iteravi, cum non ſit Sacramentum?

Of

Of the Sacrament of Orders.

9. Sect. The conferring of ſacred Orders in the Romiſh Church is called a Sacrament. Thoſe orders are ſeuen, viz. Porters, Readers, Exorciſts or Coniurers, Acolyths or ſuch as miniſter to the Prieſt at Maſſe, Subdeacons, Deacons, and Prieſts, vnder the which Biſhops are contained: for the Church of Rome doth not make two orders of Prieſts and Biſhops.

Our aduerſaries do not ſay that Ieſus Chriſt did inſtitute theſe ſeuen Orders aforeſaid: and no Sacrament is of force which was not inſtituted by Ieſus Chriſt. Onely they ſay, that Ieſus Chriſt did execute and exerciſe theſe ſeuen Orders, and ſupplied the functions. They ſay that he did the office of a porter when he ſaid, *I am the doore of the ſheepe*, Ioh. 10. 7. That he did the office of a Reader, when he tooke the booke of the propheſie of Eſay, and read it in the Synagogue, Luke 4. 16, 17. That he did the office of an Exorciſt, whē he draue out wicked ſpirits. Pope *Innocent* 3. in his firſt booke of the myſteries of the Maſſe, ca. 3. ſaith, that Ieſus Chriſt did the office of an Acolyth (or a ſeruer of the Prieſt at Maſſe) when he ſaid (*I am the light of the world*:) for that office was to beare waxe candles. And in the fourth chap. he ſaith, that Ieſus Chriſt did the office of a Subdeacon, when he waſhed his diſciples feet. And in the fift chapter he ſaith, that Ieſus Chriſt did the office of a Deacon, when he diſtributed the Sacrament, and when he waked the diſciples whē they ſlept, Luk. 22. 45, 46. Laſtly, all of them ſay, That Ieſus Chriſt did the office of a Prieſt, when he ſacrificed his body in the Euchariſt vnder the ſigne of bread. But which of theſe ſeuen offices did he, when he preached the Goſpell? This is a point wherewith theſe ſubtill Doctors do not trouble themſelues: and in truth it is not a neceſſarie thing, for a man may be a Prieſt among them, without being a preacher. There reſted nothing but to make Ieſus Chriſt an Abbot, or a Cardinall, or a Pope; for the Scripture

tare would haue furniſhed theſe Doctors with places which they might wreſt to their purpoſe with the like dexteritie.

Euery one of theſe orders are conferred by words and ceremonies cleane differing one from the other. Whereupon it followeth, that each Order is a Sacrament apart, and that it is an abuſe by them committed, to reckon but ſeuen Sacraments in the Church of Rome, when there are thirteene.

To examine each of theſe Orders, were as much as to picke ſtrawes, and to ſhew diligence where there is no need. The Order of Prieſts only deſerueth and requireth ſome diſcourſe, for that vpon the puritie and lawfull exerciſe of Prieſthood, the integritie of all other Orders, and the puritie of all religion dependeth.

Whether the order of Prieſthood be a Sacrament.

The office of the Prieſt, or Miniſter, or Paſtor of the Church, is conferred by impoſition of the hands of thoſe which conferre that Order, and which eſtabliſh a Paſtor in his office. This impoſition of hands was vſed in the old Teſtament, as you may ſee Numbers 27, and 34. of Deut. where by Gods commandement *Moſes* laid his hand vpon *Ioſua* to eſtabliſh him in his office. This cuſtome was practiſed by the Apoſtles when they eſtabliſhed Paſtors. The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* ſaith to his diſciple *Timothie* 1. Tim. 4. 14. *Deſpiſe not the gift that is in thee, which was giuen thee by propheſie, and the laying on of the hands of the company of the Elderſhip.* And in the 5. and 22. *Lay hands ſuddenly on no man.* 10. *Sect.*

The queſtion betweene vs is, whether this Ordination may be called a Sacrament? I anſwer, that if the word Sacrament be taken ſimply for a ſacred ſigne or for a myſterie, which is the ſence wherein this word is ordinarily taken among the Latine Fathers, and in the tranſlation of the Romiſh Church, we eaſily admit this impoſition of hands to be called a Sacrament, becauſe it is a viſible ſigne of an inuiſible grace, vſed by the Apoſtles.

But

But to be called a Sacrament in the ſame ſence that Baptiſme and the holy Supper are called, there are many things that hinder it. For this impoſition of hands, is not a ſacred ſigne of the couenant of God in Ieſus Chriſt, and is not common to all the faithfull: neither is the expreſſe inſtitution thereof found in the hiſtorie of the Goſpell. For Ieſus Chriſt did not eſtabliſh his Apoſtles in their offices by laying his hands on them, but by breathing on them, and ſaying vnto them, *Receiue the holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſinnes ſoeuer you remit, they ſhall be remitted, &c.*

Particularly the Church of Rome hath reaſon not to place ſacred Orders among the Sacraments: for by prohibiting Marriage of Prieſts, and calling a Prieſts Marriage ſacriledge, it maketh the Sacraments fight together, and cauſeth one to exclude the other, and to become ſacriledge.

But this diſputation, whether the ordaining of Prieſts may be called a Sacrament, is not the principall difference betweene vs; and we could be content to call it a Sacrament, ſo Prieſthood did not change the nature, & that the functions thereof were ruled and limited by the Word of God. But the corruption therein is ſo great, that Prieſthood at this day is not the miniſtery of the Goſpell. For of preachers of the Goſpell and Miniſters of the Sacraments, Prieſts are become ſacrificers of the body of Chriſt, which they maintaine to be a reall and propitiatorie ſacrifice. Their office is to make Ieſus Chriſt with words, to ſacrifice him to his Father. By the ſame corruption the Biſhopricke among them is become an earthly principality, and a dignity of a Prince of the Popes Monarchie. This requireth a Chapter apart.

Of the order of Prieſthood in the Church of Rome, and of their ſacrificing.

11. *Sect.* In the Scripture the office of Prieſts is to *labour in the word*, 1. Tim. 5. 17. and *to feede the flocke of the Lord*, Acts 20. 17. In the

the 2. chapter of the Acts, the office of Paſtors is, *to continue in the Apoſtles doctrine and fellowſhip, and breaking of bread, and prayer.*

At this day the office and duty of a Prieſt conſiſteth not in preaching the Goſpell: for in the Church of Rom the greateſt part of the Prieſts preach not. To be a Preacher, they muſt haue another dignitie beſides Prieſthood. By the manner of their ordination they are made ſacrificers of the body of Ieſus Chriſt.

The Biſhop putteth the couer and the chalice into their hands, ſaying, *Receiue power to offer ſacrifice to God, and to celebrate Maſſes as well for the liuing as for the dead.* *Accipe poteſtatem offerre ſacrificium Deo Miſſaſque celebrare, tam pro viuis quàm pro mortuis.*

By theſe words the Biſhop conferreth a charge which Ieſus Chriſt did not inſtitute, yea and ſuch a charge as ſurpaſſeth all the dignity and power of Angels, whoſe vertue and excellency is nothing in regard of making Ieſus Chriſt, and of offering him to God for a ſacrifice: which deſerued a formall commandement and an expreſſe inſtitution of Ieſus Chriſt. But there is no ſuch thing found in the Scripture.

1 For the Apoſtle, Epheſians 4. 11. and 1. Cor. 12. 28. nominateth the offices which Ieſus Chriſt eſtabliſhed in his Church. *He himſelfe* (ſaith he) *gaue ſome to be Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Euangeliſts, and ſome Paſtors and Teachers.* There is no mention neither there nor elſewhere made of the ſacrifice of the body of our Lord.

2 And further in the ſame place, their functions which God would haue them to exerciſe, are particularly declared: which are, *for the repairing of the Saints, for the worke of the miniſterie, and for the edification of the body of Chriſt.* But not to ſacrifice the body of Chriſt.

3 And it is not without cauſe, that oftentimes in the new Teſtament all the faithfull are called Prieſts: but there is no place in the Scripture to be found, where Paſtors of the Church are expreſly called ſacrificers. The holy Ghoſt foreſeeing that there would ſome Paſtors ariſe that would take that title vpon them in an iniurious ſence againſt the Sonne of God.

4 For, not to ſpeake of the iniurie done to the ſacrifice of the

the croſſe, whereof I will ſpeake hereafter: I ſay, that by this office of a ſacrificer of the body of Ieſus Chriſt, the Prieſt exalteth himſelfe aboue Ieſus Chriſt. For it is manifeſt, that to ſacrifice is a more excellent thing then to be ſacrificed: as *Aaron* was more excellent then his offerings or the things that he offered; for *Aaron* repreſented Ieſus Chriſt ſacrificing, as the thing offered repreſented Ieſus Chriſt which was to be offered. The dignity of the ſacrificing prieſt makes the offering acceptable. The Prieſt therefore ſacrificing Ieſus Chriſt, exalteth himſelfe aboue Ieſus Chriſt, becauſe the Prieſt is the Sacrificer, and Ieſus Chriſt is the Sacrifice. For although that in the Maſſe they pretend that Ieſus Chriſt is alſo the ſacrificer, yet this is certaine, that the Prieſt ſacrificing Ieſus Chriſt in the Maſſe, is more excellent then Ieſus Chriſt, in as much as he is there ſacrificed. For when we ſhall haue examined & conſidered all the actiõs whereby the Prieſt pretendeth to accompliſh his ſacrifice, as the pronunciation of the conſecrating words, the eleuation of the Hoſt, the prayers which beſeech God to accept of the offering, the breaking and the eating, we ſhall find that the Prieſt doth all theſe things, and that they cannot be attributed to Ieſus Chriſt. From whence it followeth, that in the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, Ieſus Chriſt is not the ſacrificer.

5 It alſo appeareth that in the Maſſe the Prieſt exalteth himſelfe aboue Ieſus Chriſt, in this, that he hath the Hoſt in his power, he breaketh it when he will, he carrieth it whither he will, and when it pleaſeth him to throw it into the fire, or tread it vnder his feet, he may do it. For that Ieſus Chriſt which he pretendeth to ſacrifice, is without ſenſe and motion, and cannot defend himſelfe. He cannot breathe, nor open his eyes, nor ſtirre his hands. And although the Prieſt were a murtherer, an inceſtuous perſon, or a Sodomite, yet (according to the opinion of the Romiſh Church,) he hath Ieſus Chriſt in his power.

6 If we aske our aduerſaries, wherein the Prieſthood of the new Teſtament, and that perpetuall Prieſthood according to the order of *Melchizedech* conſiſteth? they anſwer,

ſwer, that it conſiſteth herein, That euery day the Prieſt ſacrificeth the body of our Lord, vnder the accidents of bread and wine in the Euchariſt. How comes it to paſſe then, that the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes, which is one of the longeſt, and which (in a manner) ſpeaketh of no other thing then of the continual Prieſthood of the new Teſtament, and of the prieſthood of *Melchiſedech*, ſpeaketh nothing of the Euchariſt, nor of the ſacrifice of bread and wine, nor of any earthly ſacrificer? but ſpeaketh of no other ſacrificer then Ieſus Chriſt, nor of any other ſacrifice then of his death? How did he forget that wherein at this day they make the Prieſthood of the Chriſtian Church onely to conſiſt? The Apoſtle by this reckoning, doth like one that writing of the duty of a King, ſpeaketh neither of his kingdome, nor of his ſubiects: or, as if one ſhould write of the art of Horſe-manſhip, without ſpeaking of horſes. For the Apoſtle hath at large written of the continuall Prieſthood of the Chriſtian Church, without ſpeaking of the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt, wherein they will haue this Prieſthood onely to conſiſt.

7 Further, if we aske our aduerſaries, when this Sacrament of the order of Prieſthood was inſtituted? they anſwer, that Ieſus Chriſt did inſtitute it when hee celebrated the Euchariſt among his Apoſtles, and ſay, that then they receiued the order of Prieſthood. But in that action, where was there any conferring of that Order? Where was the impoſition of hands, or any other ceremony which ſupplied that want? Where was there any inſtructions touching the office of a Prieſt, ſeeing that prieſthood (according to themſelues) hath many other functions, beſides ſacrificing of the body of our Lord?

8 But who will beleeue, that Ieſus Chriſt celebrating the holy Supper, did inſtitute two Sacraments by one action? Two different or ſeuerall Sacraments ſhould neceſſarily be inſtituted by different words and ſeuerall ceremonies. We cannot by the ſame words and actions adminiſter Baptiſme and Marriage; or conferre Confirmation and extreme Vnction.

9 If the Apoſtles were made Sacrificers when Ieſus Chriſt ſaid vnto them; *Do this in remembrance of me*: it followeth, that they might ſing Maſſe (as at this day they ſay) while Ieſus Chriſt was vpon the Croſſe or in the Sepulcher: which neceſſarily at one time maketh one Ieſus Chriſt ſuffering vpon the Croſſe, and another Ieſus Chriſt not ſuffering in the Hoſt: one dead in the Sepulcher, and another liuing in the Maſſe, both at one time.

10 From hence alſo it would follow, that the Apoſtles were for a while Prieſts without keyes, and could ſing Maſſe without giuing abſolution: for the power to remit ſinnes promiſed vnto them in the 18. of Saint *Mathew*, was not actually conferred vnto them, but in Iohn 20. 23. certaine dayes after the reſurrection of the Lord.

11 Let the Reader that hath any care of his ſaluation, earneſtly conſider that which I ſhall ſay: which is, that S. *Mathew* and S. *Marke*, reciting how and in what manner, Ieſus Chriſt inſtituted and celebrated the Euchariſt among his Diſciples, haue ſet downe theſe words, *Do this*, and adde no more. Then if by theſe words, *Do this*, the Lord did eſtabliſh Sacrificers of his body, and inſtituted the Sacrificing Prieſthood of the new Teſtament, as the Councell of Trent ſaith: and if by thoſe words Ieſus Chriſt inſtituted a Sacrament, we muſt ſay, that thoſe two Pen-men of the holy Ghoſt, whereof the one, that is, Saint *Mathew*, was preſent at the action, haue made a rehearſall vnto vs of this inſtitution which is defectiue in the principall point, and haue omitted the inſtitution of this Sacrifice ſo important, and of this office of Sacrificer of the new Teſtament. If they had done as S. *Iohn* doth, who ſpeaketh not at all of the Inſtitution of the Supper, it might be thought to be leſſe ſtrange that S. *Mathew* and S. *Marke* had omitted both the inſtitution of the holy Supper, and of the office of Sacrificer. But by reciting the inſtitution of the holy Supper, and omitting thoſe formall words, whereby they ſaw he inſtituted an office of a Sacrificer and a Sacrifice, it is manifeſt and moſt euident, that they were ignorant of that office of Sacrificer, and of that imaginarie

maginarie ſacrifice.

12 I would likewiſe haue them ſhew me, who conferred the office of Sacrificer to Saint *Paul* the Apoſtle, and who gaue him authority to ſacrifice the body of Ieſus Chriſt: for he was not at the Table with the Apoſtles when the Lord ſaid vnto them, *Do this in remembrance of me.* In the Acts of the Apoſtles we ſee how Ieſus Chriſt called him, and how he eſtabliſhed him in the office of Apoſtle, in which office he ſaith, he was not eſtabliſhed by any man, but by Ieſus Chriſt. And the office whereunto Ieſus Chriſt called him, was not to be a Sacrificer of his body, *but to be an Inſtrument to beare his Name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Iſrael,* Acts 9. 15. Behold here then an Apoſtle without the office of a Sacrificer, to whom Ieſus Chriſt neuer ſaid, *Sacrifice me in remembrance of me.*

13 And ſeeing that our Aduerſaries are of opinion, that Ieſus Chriſt celebrated Maſſe in Emaus with two of his Diſciples, whereof we reade in Luke 24. I aske then, If in that action he made thoſe two Diſciples Sacrificers of his bodie? If by ſaying vnto them, *Do this,* he did not make them Sacrificers, it followeth, that theſe words, *Do this,* do not ſignifie, *Sacrifice me.* But if by theſe words he made them Sacrificers, it will follow that there were Sacrificers which had not their vocation from Saint *Peter.*

14 The Apoſtle S. *Paul,* 1. Cor. 11. 14. rehearſeth the inſtitution of this holy Sacrament, that the Corinthians might be confirmed therein. There he witneſſeth, that Ieſus Chriſt ſaying, *Do this in remembrance of me,* ſpake to all the faithfull: for thoſe to whom he directed thoſe words, are they, who in the verſe enſuing, he commandeth to declare the death of the Lord, and to eate of that Bread and drinke of that Cup after they haue examined themſelues: which is a commandement made to the people, and which euery faithfull Chriſtian ought to do. By this meanes euery Chriſtian ſhall be a Sacrificer, and may ſing Maſſe.

15 If theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me,* were words that ordained the office of Sacrificers, euery time, and as often

as we ſhould exhort the faithfull in that holy action, to doe that in remembrance of Ieſus Chriſt which Ieſus Chriſt did, we ſhould eſtabliſh as many ſacrificers as there are communicants.

16. The Apoſtle to the Hebrewes ſpeaketh abſolutely againſt this Prieſthood inuéted by men: for beſides that which he ſaith in the 5. Chapter, 4. verſe, that *No man taketh this honour vnto himſelfe, but he that is called of God, as Aaron was*, in the 7. Chapter, verſe 23. 27. he giueth two peremptorie reaſons, for the which, the ſacrifice & the Prieſthood of the law ought to be aboliſhed. The one is, that the ſoueraigne ſacrificers of the Law were ſubiect to die, & that death hindred them from continuing. The other is, that they were bound to ſacrifice firſt for their owne ſinnes, and then for the peoples ſinnes: which alſo was proper to inferior ſacrificers, who alſo being mortall and ſinners, died and were taken away. What is there in all this, that equally concernes not the ſacrificers of the Church of Rome, who are likewiſe mortall and ſinfull? And what excuſe may be giuen, why they ſhould continue & be ſuffered in the Church, which may not ſerue as well for the continuance and maintenance of the Prieſts of the Law? Was the Apoſtle ſo voyd of ſence, as not to ſee and perceiue, that ſpeaking in that manner againſt the legall Prieſthood, he alſo ſpake againſt the Prieſthood vnder the Goſpell? Would he not (thinke you) haue taken away this ſcruple, and preuented this obiection?

17 To be ſhort, the Biſhops of the Church of Rome are continuing there ſtill, and yet could neuer ſhew their power, nor their commiſſion from Ieſus Chriſt to eſtabliſh ſacrificers of his body in the Church.

Of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe.

12. Sect. The Councell of Trent in 22. Seſſion and 2. Canon, thundreth out excommunications and curſes againſt all thoſe that ſay

ſay that our Lord Ieſus Chriſt by theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, did not conferre the order of Prieſthood to his Apoſtles, nor commanded them to ſacrifice his body and his bloud.

The ordinary expoſition which they make of theſe words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, is, Sacrifice my body and my bloud really vnder the kinds of bread and wine, as a propitiatory ſacrifice for the liuing and the dead. To expound the Scripture in this manner, is not ſo much to wreſt it, as to play therewith. Theſe Doctors contrary to all apparence of truth, will haue that to be Ieſus Chriſts meaning which the words of our Lord can by no meanes beare.

1 For wee cannot ſacrifice Ieſus Chriſt in remembrance of Ieſus Chriſt. The memorials of things are of other nature then the things themſelues, as mens pictures are not the perſons themſelues. And there is nothing more abſurd nor extrauagant then the affirmation of theſe Doctors, which hold, that in the Maſſe Ieſus Chriſt is the figure of himſelfe, and the ſigne, and the thing ſignified, as if a man ſhould ſay that the Kings picture is the King, or that the King is his picture.

Tellar. l. 2. de Euchar. ca. 24. Idem Chriſtus fuit figura ſui ipſius. Et §. Tertia. Eſt vere corpus Domini & ſignum eiuſdem corporis.

2 Adde hereunto, that remembrance is neceſſarily vnderſtood of things abſent. Men may well make rehearſals or remembrances of the valors of a King in his owne preſence; but thoſe rehearſals or remembrances are not remembrances of the Kings perſon being preſent, but of his actions paſt. So the ſepulchers of Martyrs were called the memories of Martyrs, becauſe they put men in minde of their ſufferings paſt. It cannot be ſaid but very improperly, that the perſon of a Martyr is in his tombe, when the beſt part thereof is in heauen, and that which reſteth is conſumed to duſt. The aſhes of a Martyr are not the perſon of a Martyr.

3 Theſe words, *Do this*, are ſo clearely and manifeſtly expounded by the Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, that there is no contradiction to be made. For 1. Cor. 11. 25, 26. after he had ſaid, *Do this in remembrance of me*, for an expoſition of theſe words he addeth, ſaying, *For as often as you ſhall eate this bread, and drinke this cup, you ſhew the Lords death till he come.* To doe

this then in remembrance of Ieſus Chriſt, is to eate the bread, and to drinke the cup, to ſhew and celebrate his death, and not to ſacrifice it.

4 Moreouer in all the action of this Sacrament, we ſee no ſhew nor apparence of a ſacrifice. For, Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh not of a ſacrifice nor of an offering. Secondly, Ieſus Chriſt preſenteth nothing vnto God, but to his diſciples, ſaying, *Take, eate.* Now whoſoeuer offereth a ſacrifice to God, preſenteth ſomething vnto him, and prayeth God to accept of his offering. Thirdly, Ieſus Chriſt did not lift vp the hoſt, which is a common cuſtome and vſe in all ſacrifices. Fourthly, the Apoſtles did not adore the hoſt, but ſate ſtill at the table without vſing any adoration. For although they had Ieſus Chriſt ordinarily preſent with them, yet they did neuer eate him, nor euer were preſent at any ſuch kinde of ſacrifice. And if euery ſacrifice requireth adoration, how much more then ſuch and ſo admirable a ſacrifice? ſpecially in an action which ſhould ſerue for a patterne and an example in the Church, to conforme men thereunto in time to come? And if any one (when the hoſt is lifted vp) to conforme himſelfe to the example of the Apoſtles, ſhould ſit ſtill without adoring it, ſhould he not be thought and eſteemed to be a prophane perſon? And if he were in Spaine or Italie, ſhould he not be ſent to the Inquiſition? And yet in the perſon of ſuch a man they ſhould make a proceſſe againſt the Apoſtles.

5 It is to be conſidered, that if the body of Ieſus Chriſt be really ſacrificed in the Maſſe, it is conuenient and very neceſſary, that the bread ſhould bee conſecrated before they ſacrifice it. And therin we agree with our aduerſaries. Which being granted, I reaſon thus: Whoſoeuer offereth an oblation vnto God, neceſſarily ſpeaketh vnto God. But in this action, after the words which they ſay are conſecrating words, Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh not to God, *Ergo*, in this action after the conſecrating word, Ieſus Chriſt offereth no oblation to God. The action of thankſ-giuing and the bleſſing of the bread went before the words that are called conſecrating words; therefore they can be no part of the ſacrifice. For

that

that to bleſſe bread, and to giue thankes to God, is not to ſacrifice it to God. This bleſſing is vſed at all meale times, and Ieſus Chriſt did it at the diſtribution by him made of the loaues of bread in the deſart. Matth. 14. 19. Luk. 9. 16.

6 It is to be noted that the Councell of Trent ſaith, that this ſacrifice is truly propitiatorie, and that in the Canon of the Maſſe the Prieſt ſaith, that hee offereth a ſacrifice *for the redemption of ſoules.* If the Maſſe be a ſacrifice of redemption, neceſſarily it muſt be called ſo, either becauſe the death of Ieſus Chriſt is applyed vnto vs thereby, or becauſe Ieſus Chriſt dieth in the Maſſe, and ſuffereth there for our redemption. But it is not becauſe Ieſus Chriſt dieth in the Maſſe; for Rom. 6. 9. *Ieſus Chriſt being raiſed from the dead, dieth no more.* Then the Maſſe muſt be propitiatory, and a ſacrifice of redemption, becauſe in it the death of Ieſus Chriſt is applyed vnto vs, which only is the price of our redemptiō. But if that be ſo, Baptiſme and the preaching of the Goſpell, and faith in Ieſus Chriſt, are alſo ſacrifices of redemption, and ſacrifices truely propitiatory. Adde hereunto, that to apply the ſacrifice of the Croſſe vnto vs, which is the death of our Lord, it is neither conuenient nor poſſible to ſacrifice the Lord againe. For as to apply a plaiſter, or to make a payment of mony, we need not another plaiſter, nor another payment: ſo to apply the reall ſacrifice of the body of Chriſt vnto vs, we muſt not really ſacrifice the body of Chriſt. By that reaſon, to apply the death of Ieſus Chriſt vnto vs, we muſt make Chriſt die againe. And in ſo important a thing we muſt ground vpon the Word of God, and ſhew that God will haue vs to apply the death of our Lord vnto our ſelues by ſacrificing him really in the Euchariſt. *Hoc ſacrificiū laudis pro redemptione animarum.*

7 There is nothing more abſurd, then to apply vnto our ſelues a ranſome payd for vs, by paying it againe. Yet this is done in the Romiſh Church, which will haue the faithfull to apply vnto themſelues the redemption of their ſoules made for them on the croſſe, by offering the ſame redemption againe, and by ſacrificing Ieſus Chriſt againe in a ſacrifice of redemption.

8 Moreouer, that which our aduerſaries do, is cleane contrarie to that which they pretend to do: for to offer Ieſus Chriſt to God, is not an application and an appropriating of him vnto our ſelues. There is as much difference betweene theſe two things, as there is betweene giuing a thing to another, and keeping it for our ſelues. In the holy Supper we apply the Sacrifice of Ieſus Chriſt vnto our ſelues, by receiuing and accepting it by faith, as giuing himſelfe vnto vs, and not by offering himſelfe in a ſacrifice to God.

9 I would haue our aduerſaries tell me, whether the redemption or propitiation which the Prieſt offereth and maketh to God in the Maſſe, be all one with the propitiation which Ieſus Chriſt offered & made on the Croſſe, or another. If it be the ſame, neceſſarily the Prieſt muſt offer a reall ſacrifice of the death of Ieſus Chriſt, which is impoſſible; for Ieſus Chriſt dieth not really in the Maſſe. If it be another redemption & propitiation, then there is two prices of redemption, and another propitiation for our ſoules, beſides the death of Ieſus Chriſt, and vnder ſhadow of applying vnto vs the redemption made on the croſſe, they ſubſtitute another redemption, and ſo forge another Goſpell.

10 The Apoſtle to the Hebrewes is excellent in this matter. He ſpeaketh much of the Prieſthood of *Melchiſedech* without ſpeaking of the Euchariſt: whereby it followeth, that the Euchariſt is not the ſacrifice of *Melchiſedech*.

11 Beſides, in Hebr. 10. 14. it is ſaid, That Ieſus Chriſt *with one offering hath reconciled for euer them that are ſanctified.* Here is one onely oblation or offering, and the vertue thereof for euer. And to exclude the reiteration thereof, in the tenth verſe he ſaith, *That we are ſanctified euen by the offering of Ieſus Chriſt once made.*

12 They anſwer and ſay, that he offered himſelfe but once in a bloudy ſacrifice, but that he is offered diuers times in a ſacrifice that is not bloudy. Which is a manifeſt errour; for, to offer himſelfe diuers times in a Sacrifice without bloud, is alwayes to offer himſelfe diuers times, and ſo to contradict the

the Apoſtle. Adde hereunto, that the bloudy ſacrifice is found in the Scripture, but there is no mention made of the ſacrifice of Ieſus Chriſt without bloud. To dally with the Scripture by diſtinctions vnwritten, is vnder pretence of interpreting, to correct the Scripture. And our aduerſaries hauing racke the words of the inſtitution of the holy Supper, finde nothing therein but their owne condemnation. For, to alledge the words of Ieſus Chriſt, ſaying, *This cup is the new Teſtament in my bloud, which is ſhed for you*, to prooue a ſacrifice without bloud, is to condemne themſelues: becauſe thoſe words ſpeake of effuſion of bloud, and not of a ſacrifice without bloud. To prooue a place wherein there is no bloud ſhed, by a place that ſpeaketh of ſhedding of bloud, is as good an argument, as if to excuſe theft, a man ſhould alledge the law which ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not ſteale.*

13 Therefore the Apoſtle preuenteth this excuſe; for Hebr. 9. 25, 26. after he had ſaid that Ieſus Chriſt *did not offer himſelfe oftentimes*, he addeth, *That then he muſt haue ſuffered often-times*, manifeſtly ſhewing, that he acknowledged no other ſacrifice of Ieſus Chriſt but his paſſion. And tod cut off all difficulty, he addeth, verſe 27 28. *And as it is appointed vnto men that they ſhould once die, and after that commeth the Iudgement; So Chriſt was once offered to take away the ſinnes of many, and vnto them that looke for him, ſhall he appeare the ſecond time without ſinne, vnto ſaluation.* Now where is the diſtinction of a bloudy and no bloudy ſacrifice? ſeeing that the Apoſtle ſheweth, that as a man can die but once, ſo Chriſt offered himſelfe but once? How ridiculous a thing ſhould it be, for one to ſay, that a man can die but once bloudily, but diuers times vnbloudily?

14 The ſame Apoſtle, in the ſame chapter and the 22. verſe, after he had ſpoken of the ſacrifices, and purifications of the Law, concludeth by this generall maxime, *That without ſhedding of bloud there is no remiſſion of ſinnes.* If then the Maſſe be no bloudy ſacrifice, there is no remiſſion of ſinnes made by it. And you muſt note that he ſpeaketh of the preſent time, ſaying, *There is no remiſſion of ſinnes*: leſt men ſhould thinke

that

that he ſpake onely of the Iudiciall ſacrifices that were aboliſhed. The Apoſtle will haue this rule to be certaine, euen at this preſent time. Note alſo, that the Apoſtle ſaith not, that there is no remiſſion of ſinnes but by the vertue of bloud: but he ſaith, that in ſacrifices there is no remiſſion of ſinnes without effuſion of bloud. It is nothing to the purpoſe to ſeeke in the old Teſtament for examples of propitiatory ſacrifices wherein no bloud was ſhed: as the goate of *Azazel*, or, the Scape-goate, which was ſent away aliue into the deſart laden with the ſinnes of the people, Leuit. 16.20. That is not to diſpute againſt vs, but againſt the Apoſtle. And yet that goate was but a part of the ſacrifice: there being two goates, whereof the one was killed, the other let go, and both of them were but one ſacrifice. As in the ſacrifice of two ſparrowes, whereof one was killed, the other let flye away; one to repreſent the death of our Lord, the other to be a figure of his reſurrection: which two things could not be repreſented by one creature. If our aduerſaries find reaſons to prooue that propitiatory ſacrifices without ſhedding of bloud ought to be practiſed vnder the new Teſtament, the ſame reaſons of like force are to be found vnder the old Teſtament: where neuertheleſſe they were not ſuffered.

Leuit. 14.

15 He that is carefull of his owne ſaluation, will conſider what kind of religion that is, which maketh two ſacrifices of redemption; wherein Ieſus Chriſt is really ſacrificed. Two ſacrifices of Ieſus Chriſt differing in *ſpecie* and in definition, in propriety, in accidents, and in efficacie. For the ſacrifice of the croſſe is the death of Ieſus Chriſt, but the ſacrifice of the Maſſe is not the death of Ieſus Chriſt. The one is a painefull ſacrifice, the other without paine. The one bloudy, the other without bloud. The one wherein the body of Ieſus Chriſt is broken, the other wherein it remaineth whole. The one viſible, the other inuiſible. The one done but once, the other which is done a thouſand millions of times. The one done immediatly by Ieſus Chriſt, the other by the hand of a prieſt. The one which being once offered, was ſufficient for the redemption of all mankinde; the other, which is repeated a thouſand

times

times to draw one ſoule out of Purgatory. The one which is done freely, the other which is ſold for money. The one offered for the remiſſion of ſinnes and for the ſaluation of mens ſoules, the other which is offered for a ſicke horſe, for corne that is blaſted, for the ſucceſſe of a voyage, and to be ſhort, which ſerueth for all things except the ſaluation of ſoules. White is not more contrary vnto blacke, nor heauen more diſtant from the earth, then there is difference betweene theſe two ſacrifices.

16 This pretended ſacrifice without effuſion of bloud, is contrary to the nature of all ſacrifices properly ſo called. For both we and our aduerſaries ſay, that in euery ſacrifice properly called a ſacrifice, the thing that is offred muſt be viſible, and that viſible thing muſt be deſtroyed by the ſacrifice. In this it is cleane contrary. For in this ſacrifice Ieſus Chriſt which is the thing ſacrificed, is not ſeene nor perceiued: and he is ſo farre off from being viſible vnder the *ſpecies* or accidents of bread, that on the cõtrary it is the accidents that hide him & mke him inuiſible, if we beleeue our aduerſaries. Alſo that which is deſtroyed in the Maſſe, is not the thing which is offered vnto God. The body of Ieſus which they pretend to ſacrifice, ſuffereth no deſtruction in the Maſſe. For the deſtruction of a liuing thing is nothing elſe but death: the accidents onely are deſtroyed, which are not offered vnto God. And if (as our aduerſaries ſay) the ſacramentall being of Ieſus Chriſt is deſtroyed, it followeth that the ſame ſacramentall being is ſacrificed. Then that ſacramentall being is the price of our redemption: for that which is ſacrificed to God, ought to be the price of our redemption. Now Ieſus Chriſt in his natural being is our redemption, which was deſtroyed vpon the Croſſe, and not in a ſacramentall being, that is, ſignificantly, which is a *Chimæra* and a meere fiction. So that nothing is deſtroyed in the ſacrifice of the Maſſe which can be our redemption. Adde hereunto, that the deſtruction of the *ſpecies* or accidents being done onely in the Prieſts ſtomacke, when the ſame *ſpecies* diſſolue by digeſtion, wee ought to ſay, that the ſacrifice is not done till certaine houres, after

Bellarm. lib. 1. de Miſſa. cap. 2. §. Secundum. In omni ſacrificio proprie dicto requiritur res aliqua ſenſibilis quæ offeratur.

after the Maſſe is finiſhed, and that the Prieſts ſtomacke is the altar, and that the ſacrifice is made about two or three of the clocke in the afternoone.

17 And when it is to be defined, in what action or part of the Maſſe the ſacrifice formally conſiſteth, nothing troubleth our Doctors more then that, notwithſtanding all their ſubtiltie. If they ſay, their ſacrifice conſiſteth in the eleuation of the hoſt, then Ieſus Chriſt did not ſacrifice, for he vſed no ſuch eleuation: if in the breaking of the conſecrated bread, then Ieſus Chriſt did not ſacrifice, for he brake the bread before he pronounced thoſe words wherein the Church of Rome makes the Conſecration to conſiſt. And if that which is broken in the Euchariſt or Sacrament is ſacrificed, by that reckoning Ieſus Chriſt ſacrificed nothing but bread. And Ieſus Chriſt remaineth whole vnder the *ſpecies* of bread and wine, and by conſequence is not broken vnder the *ſpecies*, and therefore is not ſacrificed.

And if they ſay, the ſacrifice conſiſteth in eating, then the Prieſts mouth is the altar for the ſacrifice; and by that reaſon, as many as are communicants, are ſo many ſacrificing Prieſts.

Sanè dici poteſt, quod Chriſtus virtute diuina confecit: & poſtea formam expreſſa ſub qua poſteri benedicerent. Ipſe namque per ſe virtute propria benedixit, nos autem ex illa virtute quam indidit verbis.

Catharinus & Capitefontianus, haue made two bookes expreſly of this matter.

They are no leſſe troubled touching the Conſecration, that is, whether the Sacrifice formally conſiſteth in the Conſecration; for they agree not among themſelues about the words by the which Chriſt conſecrated. Pope *Innocent* the third, in the ſixth Chap. and fourth booke of the Maſſe, is of opinion, that Ieſus Chriſt did not conſecrate by theſe words, *This is my body*, but that he had conſecrated before by his diuine vertue. And all the ancient Fathers with one accord ſay, that Conſecration is made by prayer. Whereupon the Grecians call Conſecration, *Inuocation* and *Prayer*. At this day they ſay, that Conſecration is done by theſe words, *This is my body*, which are no words of Sacrifice nor Oblation, becauſe they offer nothing vnto God, neither are directed vnto God, but to the Apoſtles; *Take, eate, this is my body which is broken for you*. And if to conſecrate be to ſacrifice, then by this reaſon it will follow, that conſecrating of dayes,

of

of the Temple, and of the veſſels belonging thereunto, are ſo many Sacrifices.

18 Touching this point we haue inuincible reaſons, which hold our Aduerſaries ſo faſt bound, that they can by no means vnlooſe themſelues. They ſay, (and that with good reaſon) that in all ſacrifices, that which is offered vnto God, ought to be conſecrated. But in the Maſſe, that which is ſacrificed to God, is not conſecrated. Therefore nothing is ſacrificed vnto God in the Maſſe. That no conſecrated thing is offered to God in the Maſſe, it appeareth hereby; that if any conſecrated thing is offered to God in the Maſſe, it muſt either be the Bread, or the accidents of the Bread, or elſe the Body of Chriſt. But it is not the Bread, for it is no more bread (as they ſay) after the conſecrating words are pronounced; nor the accidents of the Bread, for they are not offred vnto God: The colour, the roundneſſe, and the breadth of Bread without bread, is not a fit and proper offering for our redemption; Nor the body of Ieſus Chriſt: for he cannot be conſecrated by vs; ſeeing that on the contrary, it is he that conſecrateth vs, as the Apoſtle ſaith, Hebr. 10. 14. *By one offering hath he conſecrated for euer them that are ſanctified.* So there is nothing that is conſecrated in the Maſſe, which the Prieſt can offer vnto God. Here our Aduerſaries are at ſtay, and ſay that the bread is conſecrated, but tell not what conſecrated thing is offered to God in the Maſſe.

Reaſons which our Aduerſaries alledge for the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

13 *Sect.*

It is lamentable to heare the allegations of our Aduerſaries vpon this ſubiect, and to ſee in what manner they alledge the Scriptures.

1 They ſay, *Melchiſedech ſacrificed Bread and Wine.* Be it ſo: but what do they inferre thereupon? By that they conclude that the Prieſt in the Maſſe ſacrificeth the body and bloud of Chriſt. This conſequence is ridiculous, and made

as

as it were of set purpose to discredit their cause: for from thence rather it would follow, that the Priest sacrificeth nothing but bread and wine, no more then *Melchizedech* did.

I could shew by [a] *Philo* the Iew, by *Iosephus*, by the Chaldean Paraphrase, and by diuers of our Aduersaries themselues, as by *Hugo de S. Victore*, and by Cardinall *Caietan*, and also by the Romish Bible, that in Genes. 14. 18. from whence this place is taken, it is not said, That *Melchizedech* sacrificed, but that he *brought forth, or presented bread and wine*, to refresh *Abraham* and his souldiers, not to make an offering vnto God. I could shew likewise, that the Apostle in Hebr. 7. 1. compareth *Melchizedech* to Iesus Christ, not in this, that he sacrificed bread and wine, but herein, that he is set down to be without father or mother. Also in this, that he was a King and a Priest. And in this, that he blessed *Abraham*, and tooke tithes of him as his superiour.

I could also shew [b] that the Romish Bible hath falsified this place, and put an *enim* for an *&*, and translates, *For he is a Priest of the most high God*, in stead of, *And he was a Priest of the most high God*, according to the Hebrew and the Chaldean Paraphrase: [c] or as the seuenty Interpreters translate it: *But he was a Priest*. But it is needlesse to take so much paines to confute so ridiculous an argument, and which is alledged to proue that the Masse is a sacrifice of bread and wine. One thing is not to be omitted, that is, that our Aduersaries make two sorts of Sacrifices, one bloudy, the other without bloud: one according to the order of *Aaron*, the other according to the order of *Melchizedech*: one of lesse excellencie, the other of more excellencie; and say that the Masse is that excellent Sacrifice, according to the order of *Melchizedech*. By this meanes they make the Masse to be more excellent then the death of Iesus Christ, which is a bloudy Sacrifice, and which by consequence is not a Sacrifice according to the order of *Melchizedech*. But the Apostle in Hebr. 5. 6, 7. maketh *Melchizedechs* Sacrifice to be bloudy: for there he sheweth, that Iesus Christ at his death did execute the office of a Priest after the order of *Melchizedech*.

How-

a *Philo lib. de Abraham. Iosephus lib. 1. Antiquitatum.*

b *Pererius Iesuita in Gen. ca. 14. 18. & 20. Hebræa lectio Latine ad verbũ conuersa, sic expressit hunc locum. Et Melchisedech rex Salem protulit panem & vinum, & ipse erat Sacerdos Deo altissimo: & paulo post Caietanus quasi vulgatam translationem non approbans, Quod (inquit) in vulgata editione subditur, vt causa oblationis, erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi, in Hebræo non habetur vt causa, sed vt separata clausula.*

c The version of the 70: ἐξενέγκων ἄρτους καὶ οἴνου, ἦν δὲ ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψίστου.

Howſoeuer, ſeeing that the Prieſthood of *Melchizedech* continueth for euer. Pſal. 118. 4. Hebr. 5. 6. I cannot ſee how our Aduerſaries can affirme that the Maſſe is the Sacrifice of *Melchizedech*; for they ſay that it ſhall no more be done after the day of Iudgement, and that before the day of Iudgement Antichriſt ſhall aboliſh it.

2 With the like ſubtiltie they alledge the Paſchall Lamb, to proue that the Euchariſt is a Sacrifice. They ſay, the Paſchall Lambe was a Sacrifice: and therefore, that the Euchariſt which is ordained in ſtead thereof, is a Sacrifice. Whereby they go about to proue that which is not in queſtion betweene vs. The ſpeciall point of difference is, whether the body of Chriſt is really ſacrificed in the Euchariſt; and not, whether the Euchariſt is in ſome ſence a ſacrifice.

3 They likewiſe make a great ſhew of the place in Malachie 1. 11. where it is ſaid; *For, from the riſing of the Sunne, euen vnto the going downe of the ſame, my Name ſhall be great among the Gentiles, and in euery place Incenſe ſhall be offered vnto my Name, and a pure offering.* In this place I ſee nothing ſpoken of ſacrificing the body of Chriſt, nor of making a propitiatorie Sacrifice for the liuing and for the dead. In more then a dozen places of the New Teſtament, prayers, almes, puritie and innocencie of life, and the worke of the Miniſterie are called Sacrifices. In that ſence, I doubt not but that the holy Supper may be called a Sacrifice; but yet a Sacrifice of Euchariſt, that is, a ſacrifice of Thankſ-giuing. And the word Oblation in *Malachie* is מנחה *minha*, which ſignifieth a Cake with aſperſion of oyle, which was not offered in a propitiatorie ſacrifice, but in a ſacrifice of thankſ-giuing.

This expoſition diſliketh our Aduerſaries: for they will haue this pure oblation to be the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, wherein Ieſus Chriſt is ſacrificed. An interpretation drawne out of the vnwritten word. For the Scripture ſpeaketh not of ſacrificing the body of Ieſus Chriſt in the Maſſe; neither is there any ſhew thereof in that place.

The reaſons why they reiect our expoſition, although it be grounded vpon the Scripture, are, becauſe prayers and almes

almes are no new things, in that they were vſed in the Old Teſtament; but here (they ſay) he ſpeakes of a new Oblation. I anſwer, that the miniſtery of the Goſpell, and the profeſſion of Chriſtian faith, are new things, and not vſed in the Old Teſtament: and theſe things alſo are called Sacrifices, Rom. 15.15,16. I ſay the ſame of the holy Supper, which by the ſame reaſon may be called a Sacrifice of praiſe and of thankeſ-giuing. And alſo, that touching the manner and forme of praying in the name of Ieſus Chriſt, it began with the publication of the Goſpel. And it is euident, that the ſame which *Malachie* ſpecifieth to be new, is, that prayers and ſpirituall offerings ſhould begin to be offered to God from the riſing of the Sunne to the going downe of the ſame, by the vocation of the Gentiles.

But they reply, That prayers, almes, and ſpirituall Sacrifices, cannot be that pure offering, ſeeing that we ſay, that our beſt works are vncleane and imperfect. I could ſhew that they wrong vs herein; but it ſufficeth at this time, that the Miniſterie of the Goſpell and the Sacrament of the holy Supper, cannot (without blaſphemy) be called impure or vncleane; for although that he which adminiſtreth them is a ſinner, that changeth not their nature. The purity of the Goſpell and of the Sacraments dependeth not vpon the puritie of thoſe that pronounce and adminiſter them.

4 The reſt of the places which they alledge out of the old Teſtament, ſeeme rather to be alledged in ieſt then for inſtruction; in the 1. of Sam. 2. 35. God foreſheweth to *Heli*, that he would take the office of the Prieſt from him, & would raiſe vp vnto himſelfe a faithfull Prieſt, to whom he would build a ſure houſe. And Prouerbs 9.1. *Wiſdome hath built her houſe, ſhe hath killed her beaſts, ſhe hath mingled her wine, ſhee hath alſo furniſhed her table.* Therefore (ſay they) the Prieſt ſacrificeth Ieſus Chriſt in the Maſſe. To proue the Maſſe by theſe places of the Scripture, is all one as to warme themſelues by the Moone light.

5 Now let vs come to the new Teſtament. Firſt, they alledge theſe words, *This is my body.* But we will ſpeake of the

ſence

ſence of theſe words hereafter when we come to ſpeake of Tranſſubſtantiation. Now let vs put the caſe that by theſe words the bread ſhould be tranſſubſtantiated into the body of Chriſt; and what makes that for the ſacrifice? Is the body of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt ſacrificed in euery place where it is? And ſay that the body of Ieſus Chriſt ſhould be really in the Prieſts hands, yet the Prieſt muſt not ſacrifice it, vnleſſe God command him ſo to do. Now that commandement is it which we deſire to ſee, but they could neuer yet produce it.

6 Being put from that, they inſiſt vpon the words that follow, *This is my body which is giuen for you*, or *which is broken for you*. Frō whence they inferre, that ſeeing thoſe words are ſpoken of the preſent time, it muſt needs be that Ieſus Chriſt at that preſent time brake his body, and gaue it to his diſciples.

This is to play with the Scriptures, and (in effect) to renounce their Bible and their beliefe. For they which diſpute in that manner, ſhould learne by the Romiſh Bible, by the Maſſe, and by their owne Doctors, that Ieſus Chriſt in thoſe words ſpeaketh of giuing his body to die for vs, and of the breaking of his bodie vpon the croſſe. For that which Saint *Paul* ſaith, *Which is broken for you*, the Romane tranſlation ſaith, *Quod pro vobis tradetur, which ſhall be giuen for you*. And in the conſecration of the cup, in ſtead of *Which is ſhed*, both the Romiſh Bible and the Maſſe, haue *Effundetur, which ſhall be ſhed*, to giue them to vnderſtand, that he ſpake not of any effuſion then made, but of that which ſhould be made at his death. It was our Sauiours manner and vſe to ſpeake in that ſort. In Matth. 26. 45. before any of the Iewes were come to lay hands on him, he ſaid, *Behold, the Sonne of man is giuen into the hands of Sinners*. And Iohn 10. 17. *I lay downe my life, that I may take it againe*: and 17. 11. *Now I am no more in the world*. And a little after, *When I was in the world, &c.* And Saint *Paul* 2. Tim. 4. 6. *I am already offered*: ſpeaking of his death which was neere. And Ieſus Chriſt adminiſtring that Sacrament, had reaſon to ſpeake of his death as preſent, becauſe it was the euening before he died. So Saint *Chryſoſtome* vnderſtood it in his 83. Sermon vpon Saint Matthew;

ἤδη γὰρ σπένδομαι.

his words are these, a *This is my bloud which is shed for the remission of sinnes: He said that, to shew that his passion and his crosse is a mysterie.* The Iesuite *Sa* vpon the words of Saint Matthew, saith, *In Greeke it is said, which is shed, the time present for the time to come.* And Cardinall *Caietan* vpon the 22. of Luke b saith, *Euen as the Euangelists by the time present haue expressed the future effusion of bloud, saying, is shed, S. Paul likewise saying, is broken, signifieth by the present time the breaking of his body which was after to be done vpon the crosse.* *Barradius* the Iesuite c in the 4. Tome of his Harmonie of the Euangelists, lib. 3. cap. 4. saith, *The Lord vseth the time present in stead of the future time which then approched; for the words ought to be vnderstood of his future passion which then drew neere: in this sence, This is my body, which shall shortly be giuen for you, to suffer and to die.*

It cannot be said, that these words, *is giuen*, and *is broken*, can be vnderstood presently and futurely: for one selfesame word cannot signifie both present and future. For the Masse and the Romish Bible should do wrong to translate those words in the future tēce, if they were to be vnderstood in the present tence. Euery faithfull translator which translateth that which is spoken in the present tence by the future tence, doth it because there is an inconuenience to vnderstand it in the present tence, and to follow the litterall sence. And it is not to be doubted, that if he which set that downe in the Canō of the Masse, had beleeued the reall sacrifice as at this day it is beleeued, he would haue left the word *effunditur* in the present tence, to support his owne opinion, and would not haue reft him selfe of that little weake defence which the Gospell affoords him. I say a weake defence, because these words read in the present tence, and translated according to the Greeke copie, make nothing for the reall sacrifice of Christs body in the Eucharist. For the action it selfe which is a Sacrament, bindeth vs to beleeue that they are sacramentall words, and that the sence of those words is, that in the Eucharist the body of our Lord is broken, and his bloud shed sacramentally, and to represent the breaking and the shedding of his body and

a τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε τὸ σταυροῦ μυστήριον ἐστι.

b Eadem ratione qua Euangelistæ futuram in cruce effusionem sanguinis significarunt in præsenti effunditur, eadem ratione Paulus futuram in cruce fractionem carnis Christi significat in præsenti, dicendo Frangitur.

c Vtitur Dominus præsenti tempore pro paulò post futuro, de futura enim & propinqua passione sunt verba intelligenda. Hoc sensu, Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis passioni & morti paulo post dabitur.

and bloud vpon the croſſe. In the ſame manner that the bread in that place is called the body of Chriſt, and the cup the couenant. Therefore it is expedient to trranſlate it in the preſent tence, that all the ſpeech may be ſacramentall, and conformable to the nature of the action.

For the clearing of the truth, nothing maketh more then the diuerſitie of words which S. *Luke* & S. *Paul* vſe touching the ſame; the one ſaying, *Which is giuen*, the other ſaying, *Which is broken*. For if S. *Luke* vnderſtands, that the body of our Lord is really and actually giuen in the Sacrament, we muſt alſo ſay that S. *Paul* vnderſtood, that in the ſame Sacrament the body of our Lord is really & actually broken: which the Church of Rome beleeueth not. For they are things diſagreeing, to ſay, that the body of our Lord is really broken vnder the *ſpecies*, & yet that it is whole vnder the *ſpecies*. The body of our Lord is not broken vnder the *ſpecies*, ſeeing it remaineth whole vnder the *ſpecies*. They are as much combred about the ſhedding of the bloud. For they ſay, that the bloud of our Lord is ſhed in the Euchariſt, and yet that it ſtirreth not, and that is comes not out of the body nor from the veines. That it is ſhed vnder the *ſpecies*, and yet that it ſtirreth not from vnder the *ſpecies*. And as it is certaine that all ſhedding is a mouing, they make a ſhedding without mouing. They ſay that the bloud of the body of Chriſt is ſhed, and yet that not one drop of bloud comes out. Theſe men are angry when they are contradicted, and in the meane time they contradict themſelues: they will be beleeued, and yet they beleeue not that which themſelues ſay.

And this will be yet more abſurd, when it ſhall appeare that the Romiſh Church beleeueth that the body is whole in euery drop of the wine in the cup, & that in the cup the bloud is not out of the body: in ſuch manner, that it is the body which is ſhed, and the Prieſt drinks the fleſh and the bones. It ſeemes that theſe men were in doubt to be beleeued, and tooke pleaſure to heape vp a number of abſurd conceptions.

7 Some much pleaſe themſelues with an opinion of acuteneſſe in reaſoning on this manner: All ſhedding of bloud made

for remiſſion of ſinnes, is a propitatory ſacrifice. But Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, that his bloud is ſhed in the Euchariſt for the remiſſion of ſinnes. *Ergo* the Euchariſt is a propitiatorie ſacrifice.

The firſt propoſition is not vniuerſally true. For there is a ſhedding of bloud ſacramentall and not reall, which is made to repreſent the ſhedding of Chriſts bloud vpon the croſſe, and that is no propitiatorie ſacrifice. Therefore to take away the ambiguitie, the firſt propoſition ought to be made in this manner, *All & all ſhedding of bloud made for the remiſſion of ſinnes, is a propitiatorie ſacrifice.* And yet ſtill the propoſition will beare exceptions. For in the circumciſion of Ieſus Chriſt there was a reall ſhedding of the Lords bloud made for the remiſſion of our ſinnes, and yet circumciſion was no ſacrifice. The reall ſhedding of bloud is then a propitiatory ſacrifice, when it is made by the death of the thing offered.

The ſecond propoſition alſo is falſe: for in the Euchariſt Ieſus Chriſt ſaith well that his bloud is ſhed, but ſaith not that it was ſhed in the Euchariſt. In this queſtion we ſpeake of a reall ſhedding, without which there can be no reall propitiatorie ſacrifice.

8 Their moſt vſuall obiection againſt vs is out of Acts 13. 2. where it is ſaid, *As they miniſtred to the Lord*, and in the Romiſh Bible it is, *Miniſtrantibus illis Domino*: that is, as they ſerued the Lord in their miniſterie, conformable to the Greeke, λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ. They would needs haue (but I know not why) this ſeruice to be the Maſſe. For theſe our Maſters will haue it ſo. Say it were ſo, (although there is neither reaſon nor colour for it) and let vs beleeue that there it is ſaid, that the Apoſtles were aſſembled together to ſing Maſſe: yet ſtill the difficultie remaineth, that is, whether in that ſacrifice they ſacrificed the body of Ieſus Chriſt. Furthermore I know not what moueth them to interpret λειτουργεῖν *to ſacrifice*. By the ſame reaſon we muſt ſay that the Angels ſing Maſſe, and ſacrifice Ieſus Chriſt, ſeeing that in Heb. 1. 14. the Angels are called miniſtring ſpirits, λειτουργικὰ

γὰρ πνεύματα We muſt alſo ſay that *Epaphroditus* ſacrificed and ſung Maſſe, ſeeing Saint *Paul*, Philip. 2. 25. calleth him λειτουργὸν, *adminiſtrator*. But Saint *Paul* refuteth that, and expoundeth himſelfe, ſaying, *He that miniſtred vnto me ſuch things as I wanted.* λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου.

9 Some alſo alledge this place for the Maſſe, Heb. 13. 10. *We haue an altar, whereof they haue no authoritie to eate which ſerue in the tabernacle.* By this altar they will haue the Apoſtle to vnderſtand the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, and that in this Maſſe Ieſus Chriſt is ſacrificed: which are great ſuppoſitions without proofes. But Cardinal *Bellarmine in the ſixt chapter of his firſt booke of the Maſſe, reiecteth this place, and all whatſoeuer they can alledge out of that Epiſtle for the Maſſe. For he acknowledgeth that the Apoſtle in all the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes ſpeaketh nothing of the Euchariſt, ſaying, That *the Apoſtle maketh no mention of the ſacrifice of bread and wine.* And a little after he ſaith, *The Apoſtle hath expreſly omitted the oblation of bread and wine, leſt he ſhould be conſtrained to expound the myſterie of the Euchariſt, which was too high a ſubiect to be comprehended by thoſe to whom he wrote.* Reade the whole place of the Apoſtle, and you ſhall ſee that he ſpeaketh of the death of Ieſus Chriſt which he ſuffred without the gate: of which ſacrifice the croſſe was the altar. Where alſo he ſpeaketh but of one altar in the ſingular number. In this ſacrifice the Apoſtle ſaith, that thoſe that ſerue in the tabernacle of ceremonies haue no participation.

* §. *Reſpondeo, & §. Addidit. Apoſtolus non meminit ſacrificij panis & vini. Et paulo poſt, Apoſtolus dedita opera omiſit oblationem panis & vini, ne cogeretur explicare myſterium Euchariſtiæ, quod alius erat quàm vt ab illis capi tunc poſſet.*

How and in what ſence the holy Supper may be called a ſacrifice.

The holy Scriptures call almes, prayers, an humble and contrite heart, martyrdome, the Miniſterie of the Goſpell, and generally all kind of good workes, ſacrifices. 14 *Sect.* Phil. 4. 18. Heb. 13. 16. Pſal. 51. 19. 2 Tim. 4. 6. Rom. 15. 16.

1 But there are two particular reaſons why the holy Supper

per may be called a ſacrifice. Firſt, becauſe that Sacrament was inſtituted to declare the death of our Lord vntill he comes againe, 1. Cor 11. 26. In that ſence the holy Supper may be called a ſacrifice, becauſe it repreſenteth the ſacrifice of the death of our Lord: as the manner is, that ſignes and repreſentations ordinarily haue the names of that which they ſignifie.

2 It may be ſaid, that in the holy Supper we offer Ieſus Chriſt vnto God, in as much as we pray vnto God that he would receiue the ſacrifice of his death for a ſatisfaction for our ſinnes.

3 Thirdly, the holy Supper is a ſacrifice of thankſgiuing for the benefits which God hath beſtowed vpon vs, and chiefly for the benefit of our redemption by Ieſus Chriſt.

4 The ancient Church had a particular reaſon to call the holy Supper a ſacrifice: for then the cuſtome and manner was, that euery communicant brought gifts and preſents which they ſet vpon the table, whereof one part was employed for the holy Supper, the reſt was for the nouriſhment of the poore: and thoſe preſents were called ſacrifices and oblations. Saint *Cyprian* in the ninth Epiſtle of his firſt booke commandeth the Prieſts, that *receiuing the offerings of the people which contributed, they ſhould not depart from the altar nor from the ſacrifice.* And in his Sermon of Almes, he ſaith, *Thou rich woman, which thinkeſt to celebrate the Supper of the Lord, which haſt no care to bring an offering, which commeſt to the Supper of the Lord without a ſacrifice, which takeſt part of the ſacrifice which thee poore haue offered.* Reade *Theodoretus* in the third booke of his Hiſtorie, chap. 12. and lib. 4. cap. 19. For theſe cauſes the ancient Fathers ordinarily called that Sacrament a ſacrifice. Which they did the rather, becauſe that thereby they brought infidels and Pagans to Chriſtian religion: for their opinion was that a religion without ſacrifices was no religion: as by the reproches that Pagans gaue to Chriſtians it appeareth. For *Origen* in his fourth booke againſt *Celſus*, ſaith, that Chriſtians had neither altars, images, nor temples. And in the Dialogue of *Minutius Fœlix*,

Fœlix, the Pagan *Cæcilius* ſaith, *Cur nullas aras habent Chriſtiani, nulla templa, nulla nota ſimulacra?* How commeth it that the Chriſtians haue no altars, nor temples, nor images that are ſeene? And in the beginning of the 7. booke of *Arnobius*, the Pagans ſaid, *Do you thinke then that no ſacrifices are to be made?* And thereupon the Chriſtians anſwered and ſaid, *No, none at all.*

Quid ergo? Sacrificia cenſetis nulla omnino eſſe facienda? Reſp. Nulla.

Therefore there being two ſorts of ſacrifices, the one propitiatorie and of redemption, the other Euchariſticall and of thankſgiuing, the holy Supper is a propitiatorie ſacrifice, ſignificantly and in commemoration, in the ſame manner that the Cup is the Teſtament, and that the bread is the body of Chriſt: and as circumciſion was the couenant of God, and the rocke from whence water iſſued forth was Chriſt, as the Scripture ſaith. But to ſpeake properly, the holy Supper is a Sacrifice of thankſgiuing, and as it is ſaid in the Canon of the Maſſe, *Sacrificium laudis*, a ſacrifice of praiſe. Therefore the ancient fathers called it Euchariſt, that is to ſay, a thankſgiuing.

You muſt not thinke it ſtrange that one ſelfeſame action ſhould be called a Sacrament and a ſacrifice. Albeit there is as much difference betweene a Sacrament and a ſacrifice, as betweene giuing, and taking or receiuing. So the Lords holy Supper may be a Sacrament, in as much as therein God giueth and communicateth his graces vnto vs; and a ſacrifice, becauſe therein we offer praiſe and thankſgiuing vnto him.

The opinion of the ancient Fathers touching the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt.

This is a point which euery man takes vpon him to know. For there is nothing eaſier then to collect places out of the ancient Fathers, taken vpon truſt of another, and ſo to make a booke. But to ſound into the depth of them, and to find their 15. *Sect.*

manner of wiriting for the time, the alteration of words and cuſtomes in ſeuerall ages, their intents, and the occaſions and conſequences of abuſes, which ages and times enſuing haue diſcloſed, is a thing whereunto few men attaine, and for which 20. yeeres ſtudy is a ſmall time.

For the foure reaſons aforeſaid, the ancient Fathers called the Euchariſt a ſacrifice, and a ſacrifice of the body of Chriſt, and a ſacrifice of our redemption. But where occaſion ſerued, they gaue vs enough to vnderſtand, that their meaning is ſound, and altogether contrary to our aduerſaries opinions. To prooue it, I wil produce a few places out of them.

The booke of Faith written to *Peter* the Deacon, were it *Auguſtines* or *Fulgentius* his diſciples, in the 19. chapter ſaith, [a] *The vniuerſall Church throughout all the world, doth not ceaſe to offer a ſacrifice of bread and wine in faith and charitie. For in the carnall fleſh-offerings* (of the old Teſtament) *there was a repreſentation of the fleſh of Chriſt, which he being without ſinne, was to offer for our ſinnes; and of his blond, which he was to ſhed for the remiſſion of our ſinnes. But in this ſacrifice* (of the Euchariſt) *there is a thankesgiuing and a commemoration of the fleſh of Chriſt which he offered for vs, and of his blond which the ſame God ſhed for vs.* Note here ſpecially that they offered a ſacrifice of bread and wine, in commemoration of the fleſh and bloud of Ieſus Chriſt that was broken and ſhed for vs.

a *Sacrificium panis & vini in fide & charitate ſanctæ Eccleſiæ Catholicæ per vniuerſum orbem terræ offerre non ceſſat. In illis enim carnalibus victimis, figuratio fuit carnis Chriſti quam pro peccatis noſtris ipſe ſine peccato fuerat oblaturus, & ſanguinis quem erat effuſurus in remiſſionem peccatorum noſtrorum. In iſto autem ſacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio eſt carnis Chriſti quam pro nobis obtulit, &c.* b *Manducare panem eſt in nouo Teſtamento ſacrificium Chriſtianorum.* c *Huius caro & ſanguis ante adventum Chriſti per victimarum ſimilitudinem promittebatur, in paſſione Chriſti per ipſam veritatem reddebatur, Poſt aſcenſum Chriſti per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.*

And in the 17. chapter of the 17. book of the Citie of God, he ſaith, [b] *To eate the bread in the new Teſtament, is the ſacrifice of Chriſtians.*

And in the 20. booke againſt *Fauſtus* the Manichee, chap. 21. he ſaith, [c] *This fleſh and bloud of Chriſt was promiſed before his comming, by the reſemblance of ſacrifices: in*

the

the passion of Christ it was truly exhibited. After the ascension of Christ it is celebrated by the Sacrament of commemoration.

In his 23. Epistle to *Boniface* he saith: *Oftentimes when the passion approcheth, we say, To morrow or the next day is the passion of our Lord, although there are so many yeeres past since he suffered, and that the same pasion was done but once. And upon the Sabbath day we say, This day the Lord rose againe, though there are so many yeeres past since his resurrection. Why doth not some vaine fellow tell us that we lie in saying so, but because that day is called the Sonnes day, which is not the same day, but like vnto it, by reuolution of time? [a] Was not Christ once sacrificed in his body? and yet he is sacrificed to the people in a sacred signe, not onely at euery solemnization of the feast of Easter, but also euery day. And yet he lieth not, who being asked that question, maketh answer and saith, That he is sacrificed. For if the Sacraments had not some resemblance of the things whereof they are Sacraments, they should not be Sacraments. Now for this resemblance most commonly they haue the name of the things themselues.*

And to shew how he vnderstandeth the word Sacrament, in the tenth booke and fifth chapter of the Citie of God, he saith thus, [b] *The visible sacrifice is a Sacrament, that is a sacred signe of the inuisible Sacrifice*, And a little after, *That which men call a Sacrifice, is a signe of the true Sacrifice.* And in his 5. Epistle to *Marcelline*, he saith, [c] *The signes when they belong to diuine things, are called Sacraments.*

In the Canon *Hoc est*, taken out of Saint *Augustine*, in the second Distinction of Consecration, these words are found: [d] *The sacrifice of the flesh which is made by the hands of the Priest, is called the passion, the death, and the crucifying, not in truth, but in a significant mysterie, in the same manner as the Sacrament of faith, whereby we vnderstand,*

a Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso & tamen in Sacramento non solùm per omnes paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur? Nec vtique mentitur qui interrogatus cum respondet, immolari. Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum Sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum

nomina accipiunt. b Sacrificium visibile est inuisibilis sacrificij sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum. c Illud quod abhominibus vocatur sacrificium, signum est veri sacrificij. d Vocatur igitur immolatio carnis quæ Sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio.

Baptisme

Baptiſme is called faith.

In the booke of the Sentences of *Proſper*, gathered out of Saint *Auguſtine*, in the ſame Diſtinction this place is alledged; [a] *Ieſus Chriſt was but once ſacrificed in his owne body, and yet he is every day ſacrificed in the Sacrament*: that is, (as he expounded it before) *in a ſacred ſigne*. And thereupon the ancient Gloſſes of the Romiſh Church note in the margent: [b] *Chriſt is ſacrificed, that is, his Sacrifice is repreſented, and a commemoration is made of his paſſion.*

Therefore alſo the Fathers not onely ſay, That the Sacrifice which is offered in the Church, is the Sacrifice of the bodie of Chriſt, but alſo, that the ſame Sacrifice which they offer, is his death and paſſion. Saint *Cyprian*, in his third Epiſtle and ſecond booke ſaith: [c] *In all the Sacrifices which we offer, we make mention of his paſſion: for the ſacrifice which we offer, is his paſſion.* And *Chryſoſtome* in his 21. Homelie vpon the Acts, ſpeaking of the holy Supper, ſaith, [d] *While this doath is finiſhed, and this dreadfull ſacrifice, and theſe vnutterable myſteries.* The body therefore of Ieſus Chriſt is taken and ſacrificed in the Euchariſt in the ſame māner as he dieth there, that is, as it is ſaid before in the Romiſh Decretall, *not in truth, but in a ſignificant myſterie.*

Chryſoſtome in his ſeuenteenth Homilie vpon the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes, ſaith; [e] *We alwaies offer the ſame Sacrifice, or to ſpeake more properly, we make a commemoration of the ſame ſacrifice.*

Euſebius in the tenth chapter of his firſt booke of the Demonſtration of the Goſpell, ſaith, [f] *Seeing that we haue receiued the memorie of this Sacrifice, to celebrate the ſame vpon the Table thereof by the ſignes of his body and of his blond, according to the inſtitution of the new Teſtament, we are taught by the Prophet Dauid, ſaying, Thou haſt prepared my Table, &c.* And it is to be noted, that the ſame chapter being very long, ſpeaketh of nothing elſe but of the Sacrifices both of the old and new Teſtament; but ſpeaketh not of ſacrificing of the body of our Lord in the Euchariſt, but onely of the celebrating the memorie thereof.

Iuſtin

a Can. Semel Li. 1. z. De Conſecrat.

b Chriſtus immolatur, ia eſt, immolatio eius repreſentatur, & fit memoria paſſionis.

c Paſſio eſt Dominí ſacrificiū quod offerimus.

d τῶ θανάτῳ ὁπ τελεμένῳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ φρικτῇ θυσίᾳ, ἢ μᾶλλον ἀρὰ τῶν μυςικῶν

e ἐκ ἀλλίω θυσίαν καθαίρ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιεῖμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας

f τότε δ' ἵνα τῷ σώματος ἐμνήμην ὁπ τελεῖν διδάσκωμεν, ἵνα σώματος αὐτὸ ἢ τὸ σῶν τιμίου αἵματος κατὰ θεσμὸς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ὡς γεγράπται, πάλιν ὑπὸ τῷ προφήτε δ. διδασκόμεθα μεθ' λέγοντος ἡτοίμασας ἐνώπιόν μου τράπεζαν.

Iustin Martyr against *Tryphon* saith, g *The obligation of the Cake of fine flower was a figure of the bread in the Eucharist, which Iesus Christ hath commanded vs to do in commemoration of his death.*

g Pag 201. Edit. Comel. ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως προσφορὰ τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν παρέδωκα ποιεῖν.

It is the propertie of Grammarians, and specially of those that make Dictionaries, to name things by their names, and to speake simply. So doth *Suidas* the Grammarian, in the word *Ecclesia*. h *The Church* (saith he) *maketh an oblation of the signes of the body and of the bloud of Christ, sanctifying the whole lumpe by the first fruits.*

h ἡ δὲ ἐκκλησία τὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος σύμβολα, πᾶν τὸ φύραμα ἁγιάζουσα ἀπαρχῆς ἁγίας.

The Priest in the Masse speaketh as though he beleeued not, that that which he sacrificeth is the body of Iesus Christ, seeing he offereth that Sacrifice by Iesus Christ; and desireth that the Angels would present that Oblation vnto God, and carry it to his heauenly altar: for Iesus Christ hath no need of the aide of Angels to present him to his Father. And it also appeareth in this, that he calleth this oblation, * *gifts, and presents*, in the plurall number, *which God blesseth, createth, quickeneth, and alwaies sanctifieth*: of all which words, none can be applyed to Iesus Christ For it is hard to be conceiued how the consecrated Sacrifice or Host may be called *All these good things*, if Iesus Christ be the Host. And it is likewise more hardly to be comprehended how God continually createth Iesus Christ: and how he blesseth and quickeneth Iesus Christ by Iesus Christ. These words haue a good meaning, being spoken of the bread and wine, but not of Iesus Christ. If by these words the Priest vnderstandeth that he speaketh of the bread and the wine, and giueth thankes to God because he alwaies createth and quickneth those things, he falleth into three inuitable absurdities. The first is, that he giueth thankes to God, because he createth the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, when according to their doctrine there is neither bread nor wine. The second, that he sheweth the bread and the wine as being present, saying *All these good things*, when those things are no more those things, being (as they say) transsubstantiated into flesh and bloud. Adde hereunto, that these words are said at the very same time

* *Per Christum dominum nostrum, per quem haec omnia Domine semper bona creas, sanctificas, viuificas, benedicis & praestas nobis.*

time when the Prieſt lifts vp the Hoſt to cauſe it to be adored. But is not this a thing againſt all reaſon and apparence, that then when men adore the Hoſt, and when they ſacrifice the eternall Sonne of God to God for the redemption of ſoules, in ſtead of praiſing God for ſo great a benefit, they giue him thankes, becauſe he maketh the corne to grow, and that he createth and bleſſeth it continually? That is all one in effect, as if when God admitteth any one into the Church by Baptiſme, men ſhould giue thankes vnto God, becauſe he created the water, and maketh fountaines and riuers continually to runne.

To be ſhort, the truth is ſo ſtrong, that our Aduerſaries out of the heate of diſputation, ordinarily ſay as we ſay. Reade *Lombard* in the fourth booke of ſentences, the twelfth Diſtinction, at the letter *G*: and *Thomas Aquinas* in the third part of his Summes, queſtion 83. Article 1. and you ſhall ſee that they wholly agree with vs: and that they ſay, that the Euchariſt is called a Sacrifice for no other reaſon, but becauſe that therein a commemoration is made of the ſacrifice of the Croſſe, and becauſe the ſacrifice of the death of our Lord is therein applied vnto vs that we may be partakers of that benefit.

Of Baptiſme, and of the neceſsitie thereof.

The ſame 35. Article of our Confeſſion ſpeaketh of Baptiſme, and particularly of the Baptiſme of little children, in theſe words:

Neuertheleſſe, becauſe God receiueth little children into his Church with their fathers, we ſay, that by the authoritie of Ieſus Chriſt, yong children that are begotten by Chriſtian parents, ought to be baptized.

Againſt this *M. Arnoux* reaſoneth in this manner.

ARNOVX.

ARNOVX.

By this Article, they pretend to inferre, that children begotten by Chriſtian parents, are receiued into the Church by the faith of their fathers. 16. Sect.

MOVLIN.

This is vntrue: we pretend not to auouch that, neither is it our beliefe. Baptiſme is conferred to diuers children whoſe fathers and mothers are both without faith and pietie. That indeed was *Bernards* opinion in his 77. Epiſtle, ſaying, *Who knoweth not, that touching little children, the faith of their fathers onely auaileth for them, yea and is ſufficient?* But we ſay not ſo.

ARNOVX.

By this Article alſo they pretend to inſtiſie, that although little children ought to be baptized, yet if they be not baptized, they are ſaued without baptiſme, which is a point of their beliefe. 17. Sect.

Places alledged to the contrary, Iohn. 3. 3. Verily verily I ſay vnto thee, Except a man be borne againe, he cannot ſee the kingdome of heauen. Note this word againe, *which manifeſtly proueth that he which is not regenerated by Baptiſme, is not receiued into the Church. And verſe 5. Verily verily I ſay vnto thee, Except that a man be borne of water and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God. And verſe 7. You muſt be borne againe. To what end then ſerueth it to be begotten by Chriſtian parents?*

Places noted in the margent of the Confeſſion, Matth. 19. 14. But Ieſus ſaid, Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come to me, for of ſuch is the kingdome of heauen. Doth it therefore follow that they are receiued into it with their fathers, and that we muſt not baptize them, as we ſay onely by Tradition, or that they are ſaued without Baptiſme? 1. Cor. 7. 14. For the vnbeleeuing huſband is ſanctified by the wife, and the vnbeleeuing wife is ſanctified by her huſband, elſe were your children vncleane, but now they are holy. If this word holy *were not an equiuocation, this place would haue ſome ſhew for them; but it is too manifeſt & plaine, that the word* holy, *when it is ſpoken of children, ought to be taken in the ſame ſence as a little before in the ſame place it beareth, where and when*

when it is ſpoken of a man and his wife. For neither the one nor the other being infidels, are properly ſanctified by him that is faithfull. Then this ſanctification as well of the married couple, as of their children, conſiſteth herein, that as marriage is holy becauſe it is lawfull, and in this ſence thoſe that are married are ſanctified one by the other: ſo the children that are borne of that marriage are holy, becauſe they are lawfully begotten, and iſſued from an holy marriage. Therefore the Apoſtle underſtands, that if the faithfull ſhould by diuorce ſeparate himſelfe from the infidell, onely becauſe of infidelitie, two miſchiefes would thereby enſue; the one, that the infidell thereby ſhould not haue the meanes to be conuerted, nor to be ſanctified by converſation with the faithfull: the other, that the children left with the infidell, which would conuert them to his owne religion, could not be taught the faith and worſhipping of God, as they are when their fathers and mothers liue together.

MOVLIN.

Of the ſignification of the word Baptiſme.

This diſcourſe is intangled and badly contriued. Wherevnto whoſoeuer ſhould exactly anſwer, he muſt not reſpect the ſoundneſſe of his reaſons, but the importance of the matter: but to proceede orderly herein, firſt I will ſpeake of the word Baptiſme, and of baptizing, and then of the thing it ſelfe.

To *baptize*, is a Greeke word, which ſignifieth to dip into the water and to waſh. In this generall ſence waſhings in the old Teſtament are called Baptiſmes, [a] Marke 7. 4. [b] Heb. 9.10.

[a] βαπτισμὸς ποτηρίων καὶ ξέστων.
[b] ἐπὶ διαφόρεις βαπτισμοῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι σαρκὸς.

The word Baptiſme is ſometimes taken figurately, for affliction and perſecution for the Goſpell: as Marke 10. 38. where it is ſaid, *Can ye drinke of the cup that I ſhall drinke of, and be baptized with the baptiſme that I ſhall be baptized with?* ſpeaking of the participation of his afflictions. See Luke 12. 59. Oftentimes alſo it is taken for purging and ſanctifying of the

the heart, and for effusion of the graces of the holy Ghost. So Acts 1.5. Christ promised his disciples, *That they should be baptized with the holy Ghost within few dayes.* And *Iohn Baptist* saith, *That Iesus Christ baptizeth vs with the holy Ghost and with fire*, Matthew 3.11.

But ordinarily Baptisme is taken for the Sacrament of our entrance into the Christian Church, & of the cleansing of our sinnes by the bloud of Iesus Christ, and by the power and efficacie of his Spirit. A Sacrament which Iesus Christ hath sanctified in his owne person, and established by his owne ordinance. Which succeeded circumcision, which S. *Paul* calleth the seale of the righteousnesse of faith, Rom. 4.11.

This Baptisme is conferred by dipping him into, or sprinkling of water vpon him that is baptized, saying, *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost*, Matthew 38.19.

If we take this word Baptisme generally for a washing or a sprinkling, or in a figuratiue sence for affliction, or for the effusion of the graces of the holy Ghost, we confesse that there are diuers baptismes: as the Apostle Heb. 6.2. speaketh of *the doctrine of baptisme* in the plurall number. But if we take it for that sprinkling of water which is a marke of Christianity, and a Sacrament of our entring into the Church, there is but one Baptisme: as the Apostle saith, Ephesians 4.5,6. *There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme, one God and Father of all.* The Greeke saith, *Baptisme is one.* εν βαπτισμα, εἷς θεὸς.

Touching this Baptisme, men dispute whether it be necessarie to saluation. First, we will speak of the necessitie thereof in those persons which are capable of instruction, and after of the same in little children.

Of the necessitie of Baptisme in persons that are of yeeres of discretion.

Touching those that haue attained to that age to be capable 18. Sect.

pable of inſtruction, the Church of Rome makes a ſhew to diſagree with vs therein, but in effect they hold with vs, that the baptiſme of water is not abſolutely neceſſarie for them, & that if a man being of yeeres of diſcretion dieth without baptiſme, yet he may be ſaued, ſo that that want of baptiſme happened not vnto him by reaſon of contempt, or for want of will and deſire, but by want of meanes and conueniencie. The Councell of Trent in the ſixt Seſſion, chap. 4: ſaith, * *That a man cannot be admitted into the ſtate of grace, without the waſhing of regeneration, or without a deſire, or a religious promiſe*: That is, that no man can be acceptable vnto God without baptiſme, or for wāt of baptiſme, without the deſire or will to be baptized. And *Thomas* in his Commentarie vpon the third of Saint *Iohn* ſaith, that to enter into the kingdome of God, a man muſt be baptized, *vel in re, vel in voto, vel in figura*, either in effect, or in deſire, or in figure, &c. In the 43. Title of the Decretals, cap. *Apoſtolicam*, * Pope *Iunocent* 3. declareth, that a Prieſt dying without baptiſme, enioyeth eternall glory, becauſe he perſeuered in the confeſſion of the name of Chriſt. For which cauſe, in the ſame Chapter Saint *Auguſtine* is alledged in the eight booke of the Citie of God, ſaying, *Baptiſmus inuiſibiliter miniſtratur, quem non contemptus religionis, ſed terminus neceſſitatis excludit*: Baptiſme is inuiſibly adminiſtred to him that hath bene debarred thereof, not by contempt of religion, but by neceſſitie of time preuenting him. And thereupon the Gloſſe of the Canoniſts Doctors noteth, that the Emperour *Valentinian* died without baptiſme, and that neuertheleſſe *Ambroſe* in his Oration made vpon the death of that Emperour, ſaith that he was bleſſed in heauen. That which is ſpecially to be noted in this Hiſtorie, is, that the Emperour *Valentinian* was a Chriſtian borne, and had a thouſand meanes to haue bene baptzed, if he would.

* *Quæ quidem tranſlatio, poſt Euangelium promulgatum ſine ſanctæ regenerationis aut eius voto fieri non poteſt.*

* *Presbyterum quem ſine vnda baptiſmatis extremum diem clauſiſſe ſignificaſti, quia in ſanctæ matris Eccleſiæ fide & Chriſti nominis confeſſione perſeuerauerit, ab originali peccato ſolutum cœleſtis patriæ gaudium eſſe adeptum aſſerimus incunctanter.*

To the ſame end, and to make baptiſme by water vnneceſſary, the Church of Rome ſpeaketh of two other baptiſmes, which ſupply the want of baptiſme by water, which are, baptiſme of the Spirit, which is ſanctification and interiour renewing wrought by the Spirit of God, and baptiſme by

by bloud which is martyrdome. But theſe two allegoricall baptiſmes are no Sacraments. For conuerſion and renewing of a mans mind from ſinnes, are not conferred by the miniſterie of men, but it is a worke of the Spirit of God: wherein there is no element, nor any words added to the elemẽt. This can be no Sacrament of the new Teſtament, ſeeing that the ſame ſpirituall renewing was neceſſarie in the old Teſtament. And it cannot be ſaid that this worke of the holy Ghoſt in the hearts of the faithfull doth ſupply the want of baptiſme, ſeeing it is neceſſarie to ſaluation, whether a man be baptized, or not baptized.

Martyrdome alſo is no Sacrament of the new Teſtament, for that the ſame was in the old Teſtament. And the Councell of Trent declareth, that Sacraments are not conferred, if he that conferreth them, hath not an intent to conferre them. And it is not to be thought or beleeued, that the executioners of Martyrs haue an intent to conferre a Sacrament at their executions. And there is no likelihood, that of two Martyrs, whereof the one is baptized, the other not baptized, the martyrdome of the one ſhould be a baptiſme, and the others none. Neither can I ſee how the martyrdome of a man that is drowned or ſtrangled without any effuſion of bloud, can be called a baptiſme or waſhing in bloud. Beſides that, we often deceiue or ſelues in this word *Martyr*. For 1. Cor. 13. 3. the Apoſtle ſheweth, that a man may giue his bodie to be burned, and yet haue no charity. It is a common thing among men to ſuffer martyrdome, to win reputation. Among a number of the faithfull that are maſſacred in their beds without any leiſure to ſpeake, it is not vnlikely but that ſome of them would haue recanted for feare, if they had had any reſpit giuen them to think thereon. So that in calling him a Martyr which in Gods iudgement is not ſo, we giue the name of baptiſme to ſufferings which are vnworthy the name of martyrdome.

To be ſhort, that rule ſo oftentimes repeated in the Goſpell, which is, *That whoſoeuer beleeueth in Ieſus Chriſt, ſhall haue life euerlaſting*, will beare no exception. Therefore he

that hath the faith of a Martyr, and loueth God more then his owne life, although God exempteth him from martyrdome, doth not loſe the ſame reward. For God doth not reward the paines, but the vertue of a man. Becauſe dolour and paine may be ſuffered by hypocrites, but faith is proper to the children of God, to whom life eternall is promiſed: and the want of baptiſme by default of meanes cannot annihilate Gods promiſe.

Of the neceſsitie of baptiſme in little children.

19. *Sect. Lombard. 4. Sententiarum Diſt. 4 litt. E. Si abſque baptiſmo fuerint defuncti, etiam cum deferentur ad baptiſmum, damnabuntur.*

Touching baptiſme of little children, the diſcord is greater. Our aduerſaries ſay, that baptiſme with water is ſimply neceſſarie for them to ſaluation: And proceed ſo farre therein, that *Lombardus* ſaith, That if any infant which is brought to the Church to be baptized, dyeth by the way, it ſhall be damned. This they affirme by words, but denie it in effect. For they are of opinion, that martyrdome ſupplieth the default of baptiſme with water, and that a child which is not baptized with water, entreth into the kingdome of God by martyrdome. And to proue it, they alledge the little children that were ſlaine by *Herod* in Bethleem and thereabouts as ſoone as they were borne, and all thoſe that were two yeeres old, whom the Church of Rome doth reuerence for Saints and Martyrs, without any diſtinction betweene thoſe that were circumciſed and thoſe that were not circumciſed.

But ſeeing that in the Church of Rome the Godfather beleeueth for the child which is baptized, and forſaketh the diuell for him, ſaying, *Credo & abrenuntio*, I maruell why the ſame Godfather cannot alſo make a vow for the child, ſeeing that the Councell of Trent teacheth, that a vow ſupplyeth the want of baptiſme.

It is likewiſe very requiſite to be noted, that our aduerſaries are of opinion, that the baptiſme which Ieſus Chriſt conferred by the hands of his diſciples, Ioh 4.2. was not neceſſa-

rie.

rie to ſaluation. *Bellarmine* in the 5. Chapter of his firſt booke of Baptiſme ſaith, [a] That *the Baptiſme of Ieſus Chriſt, was neither a neceſſarie meanes, nor a neceſſarie commandement, before the death of Ieſus Chriſt.* And Pope *Leo* the firſt, in his 4. Epiſtle to the Biſhops of Sicilie, Chapter 3. ſaith, [b] That *Ieſus Chriſt from his reſurrection began the gift of regeneration:* for ſo he calleth the grace of God giuen in Baptiſme. But there is no apparence that that Baptiſme which at this day is conferred by a Pagan, by a Iew, or by a woman, ſhould be more neceſſarie, and of more efficacie then that which was adminiſtred by Ieſus Chriſt and by his Apoſtles. It is to no purpoſe to ſay, that circumciſion did then ſupply that which wanted in the baptiſme which Ieſus Chriſt conferred. For the Church of Rome is of opinion, that circumciſion [c] by vertue of the action did not conferre iuſtifying grace. And Pope *Innocent* the third ſaid, [d] That *by circumciſion a man doth not attaine to the kingdome of heauen.* Then it could not ſupply thoſe wants which they ſay were in the baptiſme of Chriſt, ſeeing that thoſe to whom it was conferred were alſo circumcifed.

Many Doctors of the Church of Rome, being conuinced by the force of truth, haue beleeued that children might be ſaued without baptiſme with water. Thanks the opinion of *Gerſon* Chancelour of the Vniuerſitie of Paris, in his Sermon of the Natiuitie of the Virgin *Marie*; and of *Gabriel Biel* vpon the 4. booke of Sentences, Diſt. 4. queſt. 2. and of *Lombardus* maſter of Sentences, that maintaineth the neceſſitie of Baptiſme, and neuertheleſſe (conſtrained by the force of truth) in the 4. Diſtinction, in the letter E. ſaith, [e] That it is certaine that *God hath not tyed his power to the Sacraments, and that Saint Auguſtine vpon Leuiticus plainly ſaith, that ſome haue inuiſible ſanctification without the viſible Sacrament.*

Howbeit, our aduerſaries had rather contradict themſelues,

a *Baptiſmus Chriſti non fuit neceſſarius, neceſſitate medij aut præcepti, ante Chriſti mortem.*

b *Chriſtum regenerationis gratiam ex ſua reſurrectione cepiſſe.*

c *Ex opere operato.*

d *Extra. de Baptiſmo & eius effectu, Tit. 42. cap. Maiores. Per circumciſionis myſterium & damnationis periculum vitabatur, non tamen perueniebatur ad regnum cœlorum.*

e *Gerſon. tom. 3. Serm. de Natiuitate virginis. Conſider. 2. conſtat Deum miſericordiam ſaluationis ſuæ non ita legibus communibus traditionis Chriſtianæ, non ita ſacramentis*

ipſis alligaſſe, quin abſque præiudicio legis eiuſdem poſſit pueros nondum natos extra vterum, intus ſanctificare gratia ſuæ baptiſmo. e *Deus ſuam potentiam ſacramentis non alligauit. Quod vero inuiſibilis ſanctificatio ſine viſibili ſacramento quibuſdam inſit, apertè Auguſtinus tradit ſuper Leuitum, dicens, Inuiſibilem ſanctificationem quibuſdam profuiſſe ſine viſibilibus ſacramentis,*

ſelues then agree with vs and with the truth: and to that end build an imaginarie lodging for little children that die without Baptiſme, which they call the *Limbus of little children*, forged by mens braines without the Word of God: where they ſay thoſe poore children lie in eternall darkneſſe, in a hole or caue vnder the earth, depriued of Gods ſight, and of eternall ſaluation, without dolour and torment, and by conſequence without griefe; for perpetuall griefe and ſorrow for the loſſe of our ſouereigne good, is a perpetuall torment: and if without griefe to be excluded from the preſence of God, then alſo without knowledge of God, and without the loue of God, which is the greateſt euill that can be in a reaſonable creature.

This Limbus is a field fit to exerciſe the ſubtiltie of theſe Doctors, & a ſubiect to be diſputed of when men are faſting, to know what the ſoules of thoſe little childrē do in that priſon vnder ground, ſeeing that there they haue no communication with God, nor with the Saints in Paradiſe, nor any remembrance of thoſe things which they ſaw and heard vpon earth, becauſe there they neither ſaw nor heard any thing. As alſo whether thoſe children ſhall riſe againe at the latter day: whether they ſhal appeare before the Iudgement ſeate of Chriſt: what ſentence the Iudge wil giue; and how they can heare or comprehend that ſentence. Whether they ſhall remaine ſtill in that caue vnder the ground then when the earth ſhall be no more, or whether the Pope hath appointed them any other lodging. To what end their eyes and their eares ſhall ſerue them in that Limbus after their reſurrectiō. Whether the Pope can draw them from thence by Indulgences, as well as Pope *Gregorie* 1. drew the Emperour *Traian* (a Pagans) ſoule out of hell, we beleeue our aduerſaries. When that horrible cuſtome began which is vſed in the Hoſpitall of Paris, where they throw little children that are dead without Baptiſme into a deepe well, as vnworthy of any buriall. And laſtly, whether that any one euer came from that Limbus to bring them that newes, ſeeing that God neuer ſhewed vs of any ſuch thing.

A

A deciding of this difference by the holy Scriptures.

1 The Scripture draweth vs out of this difficultie, Genesis 17.7. where God saith to *Abraham*, *I will be thy God, and of thy seed after thee.* Now children that died before circumcision, cannot be excluded from *Abrahams* posteritie, Then God is also their God, and by consequence they are inheritors of eternall life. *For God is not the God of the dead, but of the liuing.* So saith Iesus Christ, Matth. 22. 32. and Acts 2. 39. Saint *Peter* saith to the Iewes that were conuerted to the faith of Christ, *For the promise is made you, and to your children.* Where speaking of children in generall, he also comprehendeth as well those that are new borne, as those that had receiued Baptisme. Then if God (without exception) declareth himselfe to be the God of the children of the faithfull, and acknowledgeth them to be his, and if to them the promise and the couenant of God belongeth, is it not a rash iudgement, and an iniurious crueltie against the goodnesse of God, to condemne them to eternall damnation? 20. Sect.

2 The Apostle Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 7. 14. speaking of a man and a wife, whereof the one is an infidell, the other a Christian, and of children borne in that marriage, saith that their children are holy, *Otherwise* (saith he) *your children are vncleane, but now they are holy.* If children borne in marriage where but one of the parties is a Christian, are holy by the Apostles iudgement, what apparence is there for men to thinke that those children which are borne of two Christian parents are not holy? and that they should be excluded from the grace of God, vnder pretence that they died without Baptisme? Many of our aduersaries, to saue their hon sties, say that by the word *holy*, is vnderstood children lawfully borne; and that by vncleane children, the Apostle vnderstandeth bastards and children vnlawfully begotten. Thus they play with

the Scriptures, and contradict themselues. For the Church of Rome is of opinion with vs, that Marriages betweene Pagans are lawfull, and their children legitimate. Saint *Iohn Baptist* said to *Herod*, That it was not lawfull for him to haue his brother *Philips* wife, Mat. 14. 4. Then he esteemed that the marriage betweene *Philip* and *Herodias* his wife was indissoluble, and consequently lawfull. Ancient Christians acknowledged the Pagan Emperors children to be lawfull successors in the Empire, and obeyed them, which they had not bene bound to do, if they had esteemed Pagans marriages to be vnlawfull. Then if Pagans children are legitimate, and that the Apostle calleth all legitimate children holy, as our aduersaries say, the children of Turkes and Pagans shall be holy. Certainly the Apostles intent was not to shew vs how children are holy in that sence, but to shew vs by what meanes children are consecrated to God. The Scripture also neuer calleth a child holy because it is lawfully begotten, but it is an ordinarie thing in the Scripture to call those persons and those things holy, which are consecrated to God, and dedicated to his seruice. So in the Law euery first borne that opened the matrice was holy vnto God. In the same sence the Temple, the vessels, the sacrifices, and the Sabbath day were holy to the Lord. So are children that are borne of Christian parents; who seeing that God acknowledgeth thē to be holy, why should the Church of Rome esteeme them to be prophane, and exclude from the couenant of God? It is true that they are borne in originall sinne: but Saint *Iohn* saith, that the bloud of Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne: the vertue of which bloud and the efficacie of his death, is not tyed to the water in any such manner, as that when time and meanes faile and are wanting to be baptized God therefore cannot cause his grace to be felt, and manifest his goodnesse towards the children of the faithfull, borne within the couenant of God.

Dist. 26 Can. Vna tantum. Iohannes Baptista dum Herodem ab incestu reprehenderet, dicens: Non licet tibi habere vxorem fratris tui, euidenter ostendit inter infideles coniugia esse.

Hereby *M. Arnoux* discourse is confuted, which saith, That children are called holy, because they are lawfully begotten, and issued from an holy marriage. We grant him, that in that place the children are called holy, in the same sence

that

that in the ſame place it is ſaid, that the vnbeleeuing husbād is ſanctified by the womā. For the Apoſtle thereby teacheth, that the faith and holines of one of the parties, ſanctifieth the marriage betwixt the husband and the wife, in ſuch manner, that the childrē born in that mariage are conſecrated to God.

3 Matthew 19. 14. Ieſus ſaid, *Suffer the little children to come vnto me, and forbid them not, for to ſuch belongeth the kingdome of heauen.* Thoſe children which were preſented vnto him, had not as then bene baptized by him nor by his Apoſtles, and yet he declared that the kingdome of God belonged vnto them. It is true that it appeareth not whether they were circumciſed or no, but that is to little purpoſe, ſeeing that our aduerſaries ſay, That circumciſion doth not bring a man to the kingdome of heauen. Then baptiſme was neceſſary for thoſe children to enter into the kingdome of heauen, if we beleeue our aduerſaries. Adde hereunto, that Ieſus Chriſt ſaith not, that the kingdome of heauen belongeth to children that are circumciſed, but ſimply to children. He conſidereth the Infancie, and not the Circumciſion in them.

4 To this purpoſe thoſe places of Scripture may be alledged, which ſay, that God neuer puniſheth the innocent for the guiltie, and doth not puniſh the ſonne for the fathers ſin, if the ſonne doth not participate in his fathers ſinne. As Ezechiel 18. 20. he ſaith, *The ſoule that ſinneth it ſhall dye: The ſonne ſhall not beare the iniquitie of the father, neither ſhall the father beare the iniquitie of the ſonne.* The Church of Rome ſinneth againſt this rule, when they will haue a child to be for euer excluded from the kingdome of heauen, becauſe his father negligently delayed his baptiſme. That is to puniſh the innocent for the guiltie. The example of *Adams* ſinne, which brought ſo many euils vpon his poſteritie, is not contrary to this rule; for *Adam* ſinned not as a particular man, but as repreſenting all mankind in the roote. For hauing receiued certaine benefits for himſelfe and for his poſteritie, he loſt them for himſelfe and for his poſteritie. Moreouer, that euill deſcended from *Adam* vpon vs by naturall propagation, which no way can be applyed to the wilfull negligence of parents,

in not baptizing their children.

5 If we deſire to haue more pertinent examples, the holy Scripture furniſheth vs ſufficiently. Euery man knowes that Circumciſion was the ſame to the faithfull in the old Teſtament, that Baptiſme at this day is vnto vs. And yet infinite numbers of people were ſaued vnder the old Teſtament without Circumciſion, as all the faithfull women, and thoſe which truly repented among the Gentiles.

6 Circumciſion was conferred vpon the eight day after the child was borne. In which time of eight dayes a great number of children died, which according to our Aduerſaries doctrine muſt haue bene eternally damned. The goodneſſe of God towards all men, ſpecially towards his owne people and thoſe which feare him, bindeth vs to beleeue, that if Circumciſion had bene neceſſarie to ſaluation, God would haue commanded children to haue bene circumciſed preſently after they were borne. He would not haue excluded millions of ſoules (borne of faithfull parents, and of *Abrahams* poſteritie, and to whom the bleſſing of God was promiſed) from his grace, by the delay of eight dayes. For God taketh no pleaſure in the deſtruction of his creatures, much leſſe in loſing children borne vnder his couenant. If the people of Iſrael had beleeued that which the Church of Rome beleeueth, they would haue deſired *Moſes* to haue had a ſhorter time limited vnto them for circumciſion. And there would haue bene great and extraordinarie lamentations made by the Iewes for thoſe children that died before thoſe eight dayes were expired. And it is manifeſt that the people of the Church of Rome do not beleeue that which they are taught, ſeeing that the mothers whoſe children die before they are baptized, are ſo eaſily and ſo ſoone comforted, and trouble their mindes no more with the eternall perdition of their children.

7 But ſpecially the children of Iſrael that died in the Deſarts, are a notable example herein. For thoſe people omitted the vſe of Circumciſion for the ſpace of forty yeeres together, in which time there were aboue ſixe hundred thouſand

men

men borne, and that died therein: which great multitude of ſoules are eternally loſt by the iudgement of the Romiſh Church. And yet thoſe men were they for whom Manna rained downe from heauen, & whom God couered by day with a pillar of a cloud, and lighted by night with a pillar of fire: which offered ſacrifices vnto God, and whoſe ſacrifices God did accept: whom without doubt *Moſes* would neuer haue ſuffered to haue bene vncircumciſed, if he had beleeued that without circumciſion they could not haue bene ſaued.

8 But what is more contrary to God and to his word, then to make God ſubiect vnto men, yea, and that he ſhould be ſubiect to the will of his enemies, in ſuch manner that he openeth and ſhutteth the entrie into Paradiſe at their pleaſure? And yet that is the beliefe of the Church of Rome. For Pope *Nicolas* * the firſt defined, that Baptiſme cõferred by a Iew or a Pagan is good and auaileable, ſo that the ſame Iew or Pagan did baptize in the name of the Trinitie, or onely in the name of Ieſus Chriſt. By this meanes, if either a Pagan or a Turke hath a Chriſtiã child in his keeping, he can ſaue or loſe the ſoule of that child: and if he will baptize that child, it ſhall be ſaued; but if he will not, that child dying, is preſently caſt headlong into eternall darkneſſe. By this reaſon the ſaluation of a Chriſtian child dependeth vpon the wil of a Turke or a Pagan, of whom it is to be beleeued, that he doth conferre baptiſme no other wiſe then for a mockerie or in deſpite.

* *De Conſecratione. Diſt. 4. Can. A quodam Iudæo, neſcitis vtrum chriſtiano an Pagano, multos in patria veſtra baptizatos aſſeritis, & quid ſit inde agendum conſulitis, &c.*

9 The like abſurdities riſe from the baptiſme of Midwiues, who receiuing a child that dieth in the birth, muſt haue the ſaluation of the child in their powers. By this reckoning the Apoſtles with all their miracles, and with all their wiſedome and doctrine, neuer did more good to any man, then ſuch a Pagan or ſuch a woman do vnto a child which without them had died without baptiſme.

10 But is it not an eaſie matter for a Iew or a Turke hypocritically to cauſe himſelfe to be baptized? Do we thinke or imagine that the ſame Iew or Turke ſhal be more acceptable vnto God for prophaning the ſacrament of his Couenant? and that dying thereupon, he goes ſtrait into Paradiſe?

An

An examination of that which our Aduerſaries produce out of the Scriptures for the abſolute neceſsitie of Baptiſme.

21. Sect. *M. Arnoux*, to proue that no man can be ſaued without baptiſme with water, alledgeth the third and fift verſes of the third Chapter of S. *Iohn*, where Ieſus Chriſt ſaith to *Nicodemus*, *Verily verily I ſay vnto thee, except a man be borne againe, he cannot ſee the kingdome of heauen.* And, *Except a man be borne of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God.* And verſe 7. *You muſt be borne againe.* But our Aduerſaries ſeruing their turnes with theſe places, ouerthrow that which they haue ſet vp. For the Church of Rome is of opinion, that this place doth not proue the abſolute neceſſitie of baptiſme with water to all perſons: ſeeing it ſaith, that Martyrs may be ſaued without baptiſme with water; and that thoſe which haue vowed to be baptized, and haue not had conuenient time and meanes thereunto, may be ſaued without it; and thoſe alſo that are ſanctified by the holy Ghoſt, as we haue alreadie declared. All theſe then may be ſaued without being baptized with water. And which is more, although our Lord Ieſus Chriſt ſpake vnto *Nicodemus*, yet our Aduerſaries ſay, that baptiſme with water was not neceſſarie for *Nicodemus*, becauſe he was circumciſed; and that the baptiſme of Chriſt was not neceſſarie to ſaluation vntill after his reſurrection, as we haue ſhewed before. Aboue all things, it is to be conſidered, that Chriſt did not onely ſpeake to *Nicodemus*, but alſo for *Nicodemus*, which ſpake of himſelfe and in reſpect of himſelfe when he ſaid, How can a man be borne againe when he is old? By this is diſcouered the nature of errour, which is, to interrupt it ſelfe, and to vndo that which it hath done. For it is euident, that the Lord ſpake of a new birth, without which *Nicodemus* could not be ſaued. But our aduerſaries ſay that *Nicodemus* might

might be ſaued without baptiſme, becauſe he was circumciſed. How ſhould a man beleeue theſe Doctors, ſeeing they beleeue not themſelues? and hauing ſet downe a generall rule to proue that no man can be ſaued without baptiſme with water, preſently after they breake that rule by a multitude of exceptions? The ſence of this place is cleare, Ieſus Chriſt ſpake to *Nicodemus*, and in him to all thoſe perſons that are capable of inſtruction, and ſheweth them that they cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen, if they be not borne againe in newneſſe of life, and regenerated by the holy Ghoſt: whoſe grace being infuſed into our hearts, is a baptiſme, without the which no man can be ſaued. And it is moſt certaine that this rule can beare no exception. For as in Matth. 3. 11. it is ſaid, that *Ieſus Chriſt baptizeth vs with the holy Ghoſt and with fire*, vnderſtanding thereby the Spirit mouing and purifying our hearts: ſo in this place Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, that to enter into the kingdome of heauen, *We muſt be borne againe of water and of the ſpirit*; vnderſtanding thereby, *a ſpirituall waſhing*, or the Spirit waſhing and purifying the heart. The words *to be borne againe*, can receiue no other expoſition. For *to be borne again*, doth not ſignifie to be baptized with water, but to be renewed and regenerated in a new life by the Spirit of God. And Ieſus Chriſt plainly ſheweth, that he ſpeaketh onely of the efficacie of the Spirit ſecretly working in our hearts, when (verſe the eight) he addeth and ſaith, *The wind bloweth where it liſteth, and thou heareſt the ſound thereof, but canſt not tell whence it commeth, & whither it goeth: ſo is euery man that is borne of the Spirit.* Then to be borne of water and of the Spirit, by our Sauiour Chriſts owne expoſition, is to be borne ſimply of the Spirit: and this compariſon of the winde blowing inuiſibily, cannot agree with any thing but onely with the Spirit of God.

Yet to gratifie our aduerſaries, let vs grant them that Ieſus Chriſt in this place would ſay, that without the Sacrament of Baptiſme with water, we cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen; why ſhould they not herein vſe the ſame equitie of iudgement, and the ſame diſcretion which they vſe in the expo-

expoſition of thoſe places wherein they ſay that Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh of the neceſſitie of the Euchariſt? In Ioh. 6. 53. Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, *Except you eate the fleſh of the Son of man, and drinke his blond, ye haue no life in you.* There our aduerſaries reſtraine Chriſts words to perſons that are of the age of diſcretion, & that are capable of inſtruction, and that haue meanes to participate the Euchariſt. Then let vs ſay the ſame in this place, that is, that Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh to men that haue attained to yeeres of inſtruction, and to thoſe that haue meanes to be baptized, which cannot be ſaued if they deſpiſe baptiſm. By this meanes our diſputation would be at an end, and we ſhould be at agreement with our aduerſaries touching the neceſſitie of baptiſme. And that is it which the Maſter of Sentences acknowledgeth, ſaying, That *the ſame place ought to be vnderſtood of thoſe onely that may be baptized, and deſpiſe baptiſme.*

Lomb. lib. 4. Sententiarum Diſt. 4. litt. & illud intelligendum eſt de illis qui poſſunt & contemnunt baptizari.

The marriage of pride with ſuperſtition hath begotten this errour. For pride ſeeketh to exalt the neceſſitie of the miniſterie of men, and to perſwade that the grace of God neceſſarily paſſeth through their hands. And ſuperſtitió alwaies layeth hold vpon the exteriour action, as if God did nothing without it.

But in the meane time, while the Church of Rome exalteth the neceſſitie of baptiſme, it imbaſeth the worthineſſe thereof, perſwading thoſe that beleeue her, that the benefit of Ieſus Chriſt is in ſuch ſort applyed vnto them thereby, that by the ſame they are not exempted from ſatisfying Gods iuſtice for the puniſhments and paines of ſins by them committed after baptiſme. They haue abriged the benefit of Ieſus Chriſt, to make way for their trade. They ſay, that it is no reaſon that the benefit of the Redeemer ſhould as equally exempt thoſe from puniſhment which haue wittingly ſinned after baptiſme, as thoſe that ſinned by ignorance before baptiſme. But may it not fall out, that a man may ſinne willingly before baptiſme, and ignorantly after baptiſme? Then why ſhall ſinne which is wittingly committed before baptiſme, be remitted without any ſatisfaction: and that which is committed

mitted by ignorance after baptiſme, not be remitted without ſatisfactorie puniſhments impoſed vpon it by God?

The Church of Rome alſo hath embaſed baptiſme, by permitting women and Pagans to adminiſter the ſame, whereas Confirmation is onely conferred by the Biſhop: as alſo by adding thereunto ſpittle, ſalt, & blowing into the eares of thoſe that are baptized: and by baptizing bels and gallies, as if they condemned baptiſme to the gallies.

And in like manner the booke of ſacred Ceremonies, lib. 1. cap. 8. in the ſeuenth Section ſaith, that the * Pope baptizeth Lambes made of waxe.

* *Omnibus baptizatis per Pontificem, &c.*

THE XXXVI. ARTICLE.

Of the Confeſſion of faith.

We confeſſe, that the holy Supper, which is the ſecond Sacrament, is a witneſſe vnto vs of the vnion that we haue with Ieſus Chriſt, becauſe he not onely died and roſe againe for vs, but alſo truly feedeth and nouriſheth vs with his fleſh, and with his bloud, that wee may be one with him, and that his life may be common vnto vs. And although that he is in heauen, vntil ſuch time as he commeth to iudge all the world, yet we beleeue, that by the ſecret and incomprehenſible vertue of his Spirit, he nouriſheth and quickeneth vs by the ſubſtance of his bodie and of his bloud. We ſay that the ſame is done ſpiritually, and place not Imagination and Thought in ſtead of Effect and Truth. But for that this myſterie farre ſurmounteth the meaſure of our ſenſes, and all order of nature, as alſo becauſe it is celeſtiall, it cannot be apprehended but by faith.

THE

THE XXXVII. ARTICLE.

We beleeue (as it hath bene ſaid) that both in the Supper and in Baptiſme, God really and effectually giueth vs that which by them he repreſenteth. And therefore with the ſignes we ioyne the true poſſeſſion and enioying of that which is there preſented vnto vs. And for this cauſe all thoſe which come to the ſacred table of Ieſus Chriſt with a pure faith, like vnto a veſſel, truly receiue that which the ſignes teſtifie vnto them, that is, that the body and the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt are no leſſe nouriſhing to the ſoule, then the bread and the wine are vnto the body.

THE XXXVIII. ARTICLE.

So we ſay, that water being a weake element, doth teſtifie the truth of the interior waſhing of our ſoules in the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, by the efficacy of his Spirit; and that the bread & the wine being giuen vnto vs in the Supper, truly ſerue vs for ſpirituall food, becauſe they ſhew vs as it were to the eye, that the fleſh of Ieſus Chriſt is our meate, and his bloud our drinke. And we reiect all fantaſticall perſons and Sacramentaries, that will not receiue ſuch ſignes and markes, ſeeing that our Lord Ieſus Chriſt with his owne mouth pronounceth and ſaith, *This is my body*, and *This cup is my bloud.*

Of theſe three Articles, which comprehend the beliefe of our

our Churches touching the holy Supper, *M. Arnoux* onely layeth hold on the laſt, and diſcourſeth in this manner.

ARNOVX.

Of the reall vnion of the faithfull with Ieſus Chriſt, and of the eating and participation of his body.

All this Article excludeth the truth and reality of the body and the blond (to ſerue vs with the onely figure, whereby we are holden vnder the Iewiſh elements, and ſhadowes without bodies.) And although that ſome Miniſters of the later times, being Calvins diſciples, by his example haue induced by a ſubtill method the inuention to ſpeake as we do, ſaying, that the body of Chriſt ſubſtantially, and not onely in effect, is giuen and vnited to the faithfull in the Supper, yet when they are preſſed to make anſwer, whether the bodie of Chriſt is locally preſent in the ſignes, they ſay no, and that it is as diſtant from them, as heauen is from the earth: from whence enſueth manifeſt contradiction, and the abuſe is diſcouered by this Syllogiſme. 22. Sect.

It is impoſſible that two ſubſtances diſtant one from the other as heauen from the earth, ſhould be entirely and ſubſtantially conioyned one with the other.

But the body of the Sonne of God is diſtant from the ſignes or ſpecies of bread and wine, as heauen is from the earth.

Ergo it cannot be entirely and ſubſtantially conioyned to the body of thoſe that receiue the ſignes thereof. Therefore it is vainly ſaid of them (to abuſe the world) that the bodie is ſubſtantially giuen, ſeeing that by their Article it is ſaid, that the bread and the wine are giuen to them as it were to the eye, that the bodie and the blond are our nouriſhment.

MOVLIN.

If I would ſimply follow the ſteps of this Doctor, and content my ſelfe to confute him, this worke would be very ſlender and of ſmall inſtruction. For therein he neither comprehends

head nor beliefe nor his owne, and doth so much contradict his owne as our Church, and obserueth neither order, consequence nor sence in his discourse.

He makeeh vs say that we exclude the truth of the body of Christ, and are content with the figure onely, which is cleane contrary to that which we beleeue. While the signes are present before our eyes, and in our motubes, Iesus Christ is present to our faith, and really giuen to our soules, by a contract made, as by a Kings letters patents, an house or an inheritãce may be really giuen vnto vs, although it be farre from vs. The Sunne ioyneth really with our sight, although it be in heauen and we here on earth. The head is really ioyned with the feete by meanes of the soule, which maketh them to b eall of one body, altho gh their posture in their body be far asunder. The husband is really one body and one flesh with his wife, although they be absent one from the other. If reall and substantiall vnions are found to be in naturall things distant by place one from another, how much more in diuine things? Cannot Iesus Christ really ioyne himselfe to our soules, and by our soules to our bodies, by the meanes of his Spirit dwelling in our bodies? Cannot he come to vs, without suffering himselfe to be deuoured by his enemies, gnawed with mens teeth, and to be inclosed in a wafer, which may be carried away by a beast? The Scripture saith, that we are one bodie with Iesus Christ, and that he is the head, and we the members; which vnion I thinke our aduersaries will not call imaginarie and figuratiue; they rather acknowledge it to be reall and true: and yet this vnion is as well without the Eucharist as in the Eucharist. For they are constrained to retaine the words, although they are ignorant of the thing it selfe, and striue against the fruite and vertue thereof: and with carnall spirits cannot conceiue any other reall vnion with the bodie of Iesus Christ, then that which is made by eating, as if Iesus Christ were made for the belly, and not for the consciences of men: or as if it were not the priuiledge of the children of God, to be really conioyned with the Sonne of God. for they make the wicked and hypocrites also to eate Iesus Christ,

and

and really to participate his body; thinking that the dead can eate the bread of life, and that the enemies of God can be really ioyned with the Sonne of God: esteeming the reall eating with the mouth, to be a much more excellent thing then that which is done by faith: although the eating by the mouth is common both to the good and to the bad, but that which is by faith, is proper to the faithfull: and that the eating with the mouth without eating by faith, is hurtfull, & turneth to condemnation, but the eating by faith is alwaies profitable, and necessary to saluation.

Some spirits grosly subtil mocke at the spirituall vnion of Iesus Christ with vs, as if it were a meere imagination, and say that by the same reason the Spirit of Christ should be substantially vnited with all creatures, because he is in all places: which they speake without reason; for although the Spirit of God is in euery place and in all creatures, yet he is not vnited with euery one of them: there is nothing but the soule that is capable of that vnion. As in naturall formes, it is one thing to assist, another thing to giue forme or shape: so in the Spirit of Christ, it is one thing to be present with any thing, and another thing to vnite it selfe thereunto to quicken and to sanctifie it. *But he that is ioyned vnto the Lord* (saith the Apostle, 1. Cor 6. 17.) *is made one Spirit with him.* So by the vnion of the Spirit of Iesus Christ with our spirits, his body also is made one body with ours, as when the two extreme linkes of a chaine are ioyned together by a thrid.

M. Arnoux argues no better when he maketh vs to say that in the Supper the body of Iesus Christ is giuen in substance, and not onely by effect; as if to giue Iesus Christ in substance, and to giue him effectually, were not all one thing. He speaketh as if I should say, that such a man was not onely beheaded, but also that he had his head cut off.

It likewise appeareth, that he vnderstandeth not his owne beliefe, when he disliketh that we beleeue not that Iesus Christ is locally present in the signes of bread and wine: for the Church of Rome doth not beleeue it no more then we.

The Syllogiſme which he frameth, is not a Syllogiſme, for the concluſion is compoſed of diuers pieces which are not found in the propoſitions. In neither of the propoſitions is there a word *of the body of thoſe that receiue the ſignes.* Now nothing ought to be in the concluſion, which is not found in the propoſitions.

It is one thing to ſpeake of the vnion of the body of Ieſus Chriſt with the ſignes, and another thing to ſpeake of the vnion of the body of Ieſus Chriſt with our ſoules, and by our ſoules with our bodies. The ſignes are ioyned with Ieſus Chriſt by ſacramentall vnion, as the water in Baptiſme is ioyned with the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt. But the body of Ieſus Chriſt is vnited to our ſoules by a reall and ſpirituall vnion.

He goeth on with his argument, and gloſſeth vpon the places of Scripture by vs noted in the margent of our Confeſſion.

ARNOVX.

Of the Reall preſence of the body of Chriſt in the Supper, and of Tranſſubſtantiation.

23 Sect. *Places noted in the margent of the Confeſſion. Iohn 6. 31. Our Fathers did eate Manna in the deſart, as it is written, He gaue them bread from heauen to eate. 1. Cor. 11. 23, 24. Ieſus tooke bread, and when he had giuen thankes, he brake it, and ſaid, Take, eate, this is my body which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of me. Matt. 26. 26. And as they did eate, Ieſus tooke the bread, and when he had bleſſed it, he brake it, and gaue it to his diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eate, this is my body.*

In all theſe places, is there any direct place by the which it is ſaid, that the figure onely is giuen vnto vs, that the bread and the wine are giuen vs for food, and that the bread and the wine ſhew vs (as it were to the eyes) the fleſh and the bloud? I will go a little further, where are thoſe direct words in a matter of ſo great conſequence? and with what face can all the Miniſters in the world

ſuffer

ſuffer and endure the reproch of the Sonne of God, when at the day of iudgement of the whole world he ſhall ſay vnto them, I haue taught by foure of my vnreproueable Regiſters, and thoſe of whom you made great account, what I ſaid from my owne mouth at the inſtitution of the Sacrament of loue and vnion: that is; This is my body; this is my blood; and my Church in ſo many ages hath beleeued it, and you vpon your owne credits quarelled with my Church, and ſaid, that I would haue ſaid, This is bread, this is wine, this ſheweth my fleſh, this ſheweth my blood. Why haue you made a ſigne of that which I haue giuen in truth? and what hurt could it haue bene vnto you, to ſuffer the world to beleeue my word barely and ſimply vnderſtood, in a thing which I could not propound by equiuocation or in a double ſence, without incurring the blame of falſhood?

Contrary places of Scripture. Iohn 6. 55, 56. My fleſh is meate indeed, and my blood is drinke indeed; he that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Nothing can be ſaid more expreſly, and I cannot imagine any more expreſſe gloſſe then this text of it ſelfe is, without any conſequence or figure.

MOVLIN.

The point of the holy Supper, wherein the truth is more cleare then in any other, is that which Satan hath moſt wrapped in obſcuritie; and of a band of vnitie, hath made it the ſeed of diſcord; and of an ayde and meanes to lift vp our faith to Ieſus Chriſt, hath inuented a meanes to pull downe Ieſus Chriſt, and to put him into mans power.

We haue ſpoken of this matter in a booke expreſly made for the ſame purpoſe, which as yet hath not bene anſwered. Here I will ſay as much as ſhall ſuffice to cleare this difference, and to defend the truth contained in our Confeſſion of the faith.

The beliefe of both parties.

The Church of Rome* is of opinion, that preſently after 24. Sect. Concil. Trid. *Seſſ. 13.

theſe words, *Hoc eſt enim corpus meum*, are pronounced, the ſubſtance of the bread changeth into the body of our Lord by tranſſubſtantiation, and the ſubſtance of the wine into the bloud of our Lord: In ſuch manner neuertheleſſe, that by concomitance the body alſo is whole in euery drop of the wine in the cup, as the body is whole in euery crum and vnder euery part of the Hoſt: which is done by vertue of the words, which being pronounced as well ouer the ſubſtance of the bread as ouer the accidents, do not worke but vpon the ſubſtance, ſo that the accidents remaine without a ſubiect. Not that the body of Ieſus Chriſt which ſitteth at the right hand of God commeth into the hoſt, but it is made there by tranſſubſtantiation.

Vpon condition neuertheleſſe, [a] that the Prieſt muſt haue an intent to conſecrate. For without that the conſecration is not made: and yet in the meane time the people out of a pious and an holy preſuppoſition do not ceaſe to adore the hoſt at all aduentures. *Bellarmine* in the ſeuen and twentieth Chapter of his firſt booke of Sacraments [b] ſaith, Suppoſe that it ſufficeth that the Prieſt hath an intent to do as the Church of Geneua doth.

To confirme this tranſſubſtantiation and [c] reall preſence, our aduerſaries produce diuers miracles, wherein the hoſt (as they ſay) being prickt, hath ſhed great drops of bloud, and in ſome of them the hoſt appeared like a little child, entring into mens mouthes: [d] and ſay that certaine ſhepheards hauing pronounced the words of conſecration vpon their bread being at breakfaſt, changed all the bread into fleſh.

And becauſe many inconueniences happen, either that the conſecrated cup may freeze, or that the conſecrated hoſt may be ſtolne, or is eaten by mice, or vomited vp againe by weakneſſe of body, the penitentiall Canons, and [e] the Cauteles of the Maſſe haue ordained certaine rules for euery one of theſe inconueniences, and ſay, that it is not to be

[a] *Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 7. can. 11.*

[b] *Extra. de celebr. Miſſ. Tit. 41. cap. De homine. §. Petes.*

[c] *Plantina in Leone 3. Iodocus Coccius. Matthæus Paris an. 1247. pag 713.*

[d] *Durand. Ration. lib 4. cap. 35. & Innocent 3. lib. 3. de Myſter. Miſſæ cap. 1. Canon Pœnitentialis 30. Quando mus comedit vel corrodit corpus Chriſti.*

[e] *Cautele Miſſæ. Species diſtinguantur, & reuerenter ſumantur, & vomitus comburatur, &c.*

thought

it is to be vnderſtood, that the language of the Iewes in the old Teſtament was the Hebrew tongue, which was ſtill called the Hebrew tõgue, although it fell from the purity thereof by mixing it with the Syrian tongue. In this Hebrew tongue the word *ſignifie* or *repreſent* is not found: but the ancient Hebrew Teſtament in ſtead of *ſignifie*, alwayes vſeth the word *is*. So *Ioſeph* in Geneſis 40. 12. interpreting the dreames of *Pharoes* cup-bearer and of his baker, ſaith, *The three branches of the vine are three dayes*; and in the 18. verſe, *Thee three baskets are three dayes*, that is, ſignifie three dayes: and in the 41. chapter verſe 16. *The ſeuen fat kine are ſeuen yeeres, and the ſeuen full eares of corne are ſeuen yeeres. And the ſeuen leane euill-fauoured kine which came vp after the other, are ſeuen yeeres: and the ſeuen emptie eares of corne blaſted with the Eaſt winde, are ſeuen yeeres of famine.* And in foure places of that Chapter the word *are* is put for *ſignifie* or *repreſent*. So in Ezechiel 37. 11. *Theſe bones are the whole houſe of Iſrael*: to ſhew, that it was repreſented and figured by thoſe bones. And Daniel 2. 38. *It is thou ô King that art this head of gold*, in ſtead of ſaying, It is thou that art ſignified and prefigured by the head of gold. And 4. 20, 22. *The tree which thou ſaweſt, is thou ô King*. And 7. 17. *Theſe foure great beaſts, are foure kings*. And 21. verſe, *The ten hornes are ten kings*. And in the 8. chap. 20. and 21. verſes, *The ram which thou ſaweſt hauing two hornes, are the Kings of Media and Perſia: and the rough goate is the king of Græcia*. In all theſe places and many others, the word *are* is as much as to *ſignifie* or *repreſent*. From thence it comes, that although the Greeke tongue wanteth no words to ſay, *ſignifie*, *figure* or *repreſent*, yet the new Teſtament in Greeke, which oftentimes imitateth the Hebrew phraſe, ordinarily ſaith, *is* for *ſignifieth*. So the Apoſtle 1. Cor. 10. 4. ſpeaking of the rocke from whence water iſſued forth in the deſart, ſaith, that *the rocke was Chriſt*. And Galat. 4. 22, 24. it is ſaid, that the bond-ſeruant and the free, that is, *Agar* and *Sara*, are the two couenants: and Apocal. 17. 9, 18. *The ſeuen heads are ſeuen mountaines whereupon the woman ſitteth, and the woman which thou ſaweſt, is that great Citie*.

Then

The Syllogiſme which he frameth, is not a Syllogiſme, for the concluſion is compoſed of diuers pieces which are not found in the propoſitions. In neither of the propoſitions is there a word *of the body of thoſe that receiue the ſignes.* Now, nothing ought to be in the concluſion, which is not found in the propoſitions.

It is one thing to ſpeake of the vnion of the body of Ieſus Chriſt with the ſignes, and another thing to ſpeake of the vnion of the body of Ieſus Chriſt with our ſoules, and by our ſoules with our bodies. The ſignes are ioyned with Ieſus Chriſt by ſacramentall vnion, as the water in Baptiſme is ioyned with the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt. But the body of Ieſus Chriſt is vnited to our ſoules by a reall and ſpirituall vnion.

He goeth on with his argument, and gloſſeth vpon the places of Scripture by vs noted in the margent of our Confeſſion.

ARNOVX.

Of the Reall preſence of the body of Chriſt in the Supper, and of Tranſſubſtantiation.

23. Sect. *Places noted in the margent of the Confeſſion. Iohn 6. 31. Our Fathers did eate Manna in the deſart, as it is written, He gaue them bread from heauen to eate. 1. Cor. 11. 23, 24. Ieſus tooke bread, and when he had giuen thankes, he brake it, and ſaid, Take, eate, this is my body which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of me. Matt. 26. 26. And as they did eate, Ieſus tooke the bread, and when he had bleſſed it, he brake it, and gaue it to his diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eate, this is my body.*

In all theſe places, is there any direct place by the which it is ſaid, that the figure onely is giuen vnto vs, that the bread and the wine are giuen vs for food, and that the bread and the wine ſhew vs (as it were to the eyes) the fleſh and the bloud? I will go a little further, where are thoſe direct words in a matter of ſo great conſequence? and with what face can all the Miniſters in the world

ſuffer

ſuffer and endure the reproch of the Sonne of God, when at the day of iudgement of the whole world he ſhall ſay vnto them, I haue taught by foure of my vnreproueable Regiſters, and thoſe of whom you made great account, what I ſaid from my owne mouth at the inſtitution of the Sacrament of loue and vnion: that is; This is my body; this is my blond; and my Church in ſo many ages hath beleeued it, and you vpon your owne credits quarelled with my Church, and ſaid, that I would haue ſaid, This is bread, this is wine, this ſheweth my fleſh, this ſheweth my blond. Why haue you made a ſigne of that which I haue giuen in truth? and what hurt could it haue bene vnto you, to ſuffer the world to beleeue my word barely and ſimply vnderſtood, in a thing which I could not propound by equiuocation or in a double ſence, without incurring the blame of falſhood?

Contrary places of Scripture. Iohn 6. 55, 56. My fleſh is meate indeed, and my blond is drinke indeed; he that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blond, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Nothing can be ſaid more expreſly, and I cannot imagine any more expreſſe gloſſe then this text of it ſelfe is, without any conſequence or figure.

MOVLIN.

The point of the holy Supper, wherein the truth is more cleare then in any other, is that which Satan hath moſt wrapped in obſcuritie; and of a band of vnitie, hath made it the ſeed of diſcord; and of an ayde and meanes to lift vp our faith to Ieſus Chriſt, hath inuented a meanes to pull downe Ieſus Chriſt, and to put him into mans power.

We haue ſpoken of this matter in a booke expreſly made for the ſame purpoſe, which as yet hath not bene anſwered. Here I will ſay as much as ſhall ſuffice to cleare this difference, and to defend the truth contained in our Confeſſion of the faith.

The beliefe of both parties.

The Church of Rome* is of opinion, that preſently after 24. *Sect. Concil. Trid.* *Seſſ. 13.*

theſe words, *Hoc eſt enim corpus meum*, are pronounced, the ſubſtance of the bread changeth into the body of our Lord by tranſſubſtantiation, and the ſubſtance of the wine into the bloud of our Lord: In ſuch manner neuertheleſſe, that by concomitance the body alſo is whole in euery drop of the wine in the cup, as the body is whole in euery crum and vnder euery part of the Hoſt: which is done by vertue of the words, which being pronounced as well ouer the ſubſtance of the bread as ouer the accidents, do not worke but vpon the ſubſtance, ſo that the accidents remaine without a ſubiect. Not that the body of Ieſus Chriſt which ſitteth at the right hand of God commeth into the hoſt, but it is made there by tranſſubſtantiation.

Vpon condition neuertheleſſe, [a] that the Prieſt muſt haue an intent to conſecrate. For without that the conſecration is not made: and yet in the meane time the people out of a pious and an holy preſuppoſition do not ceaſe to adore the hoſt at all aduentures. *Bellarmine* in the ſeuen and twentieth Chapter of his firſt booke of Sacraments [b] ſaith, Suppoſe that it ſufficeth that the Prieſt hath an intent to do as the Church of Geneua doth.

To confirme this tranſſubſtantiation and [c] reall preſence, our aduerſaries produce diuers miracles, wherein the hoſt (as they ſay) being prickt, hath ſhed great drops of bloud, and in ſome of them the hoſt appeared like a little child, entring into mens mouthes: [d] and ſay that certaine ſhepheards hauing pronounced the words of conſecration vpon their bread being at breakfaſt, changed all the bread into fleſh.

And becauſe many inconueniences happen, either that the conſecrated cup may freeze, or that the conſecrated hoſt may be ſtolne, or is eaten by mice, or vomited vp againe by weakneſſe of body, the penitentiall Canons, and [e] the Cauteles of the Maſſe haue ordained certaine rules for euery one of theſe inconueniences, and ſay, that it is not to be

a *Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 7. can. 11.*

b *Extra. de cel. libr. Miſſ. Tit. 41. cap. De bo. mine. §. Petes.*

c *Plantina in Leone 3. Iodocus Coccius. Matthæus Paris an. 1247. pag 713.*

d *Durand. Ration lib 4. cap. 35. & Innocent 3. lib. 3. de Myſter. Miſſæ cap. 1.*

e *Canon Pœnitentialis 30. Quando mus comedit vel corrodit corpus Chriſti.*

c *Cautele Miſſæ Species diſtinguantur, & reuerenter ſumantur, & vomitus comburatur, &c.*

thought

thought a strange matter, that rats or dogges may eate the whole body of Iesus Christ now when he sitteth at the right hand of God in his glory, seeing that while he was in his infirmitie here on earth, the theeues might sucke the drops of his bloud, and dogs might licke vp his bloud that fell downe from the crosse.

By this doctrine the Priest may do that which all the Angels and Saints together cannot do; for he can make Iesus Christ; and hauing made God by certaine words, he hath God in his owne power. From thence proceedeth their manner of speaking, to lift vp God, to eate him, and to receiue their Creator. From thence proceedeth this prodigious doctrine, that a Priest may transsubstantiate whole vessels of wine, and change all the bread in the market into flesh. From thence proceedeth the adoration of the host in the Priests hands, but not after it is gone downe into his stomacke, although it be present there as well as in the host.

Toletus de Instruct. sacerd. lib. 2. cap. 25. Posset consecrare sacerdos multos cophinos panis & vini dolium, si præsentia ita haberet.

To shew in what manner the body of our Lord is in the Eucharist, they say, that his body is there, but not corporally: and that his body is there, but spiritually, with as much reason as if they said, that a spirit is present corporally. They likewise say, that he is in that place, but not locally, that he is visible vnder the *species*, & yet that the *species* hinder vs frō the sight of him: that he is there in length without extention: that he is a body without a locall place; that in euery part of the host he hath his greatnesse, and that in euery crum of the bread he hath his full magnitude as he had vpon the crosse: that he hath two eyes in one selfe-same point: that he cannot moue nor breathe vnder the host: that he is whole in heauen, and whole in earth, and yet not in the region betweene both, nor separated from himselfe: that in the host, there is *quantitas, & nihil quantum*, length and nothing that is long, sauour and nothing that sauoreth, whitenesse and nothing that is white. This is it which they call the accidents without subiect. This is the diuinitie of this age.

Innocentius 3. l. 4. de myster. Missæ. cap. 2. Est enim hic color & sapor, quantitas & qualitas cum nihil alterutro sit colorum aut sapidum, aut quantum, aut quale.

It is one of the greatest graces which God hath shewed vnto vs, that we are freed from so strong an errour, and that

in our Churches they speake not of making of God by certaine words, nor of adoring Iesus Christ made by mans hāds, as also that we beleeue in one Iesus Christ, which is very mā, and hath a true humane body, and who by this meanes is our brother by his conformitie with our nature, & by the vnion of his Spirit, who being ascended vp into heauen, will come againe vnto vs the second time, at the latter day.

Touching the holy Supper, we beleeue with the Apostle, 1. Cor. 11. 26. that we eate bread, to shew forth the death of the Lord. And 1. Cor. 10. 16. That *the bread which we breake, is the communion of the body of Christ.* Which bread is called the body of our Lord, because it is the commemoration thereof, as Iesus Christ addeth to expound his meaning, according to the manner of the holy Scripture, which is, to giue the signes the names of those things which they signifie. Not that we beleeue that those signes are onely bare figures bereft of all truth, but with the Apostle we beleeue, that breaking that bread, we communicate in the body of Christ. Those signes are not onely significatiue, but also exhibitiue of Iesus Christ and of his benefits. For although Iesus Christ is not inclosed in that bread, yet is he truly made ours, if with true faith and loue of God we participate of this holy Sacrament, and put all our trust and confidence in the death of Iesus Christ. Therefore we do not adore the Sacrament, but Iesus Christ which is in heauen: taking the Apostles for an example, who did not adore the host in the holy Supper, as also Iesus Christ neither commanded them to adore it, nor vsed any elevation.

A proofe of the doctrine of our Churches, by the words of the institution of this Sacrament.

Our Lord Iesus Christ, after the last Paschall lambe celebrated with his disciples, instituted another Sacrament, which S. *Paul* calleth the Supper of the Lord, at the which he

he will haue bread to be broken and eaten by the faithfull, and a cup with wine distributed in remembrance of him, and to declare his death till he come againe. This institution is found in Saint Matth. 26. in Saint Marke 14. in Saint Luke 22. and 1. Cor. 11. From these places, not by peecemeale as our aduersaries do, but wholly and compared together, the truth ought to be drawne.

Saint *Matthew* saith, *That Iesus Christ tooke the bread, and when he had blessed it, he brake it, and gaue it to his disciples, and said, Take, eate, this is my body.* Saint *Luke* saith, that he added, *which is giuen for you, do this in remembrance of me.* And S. *Paul*, in stead of saying, *Which is giuen for you* saith, *Which is broken for you.* The holy Ghost which guided the hands and the spirits of the Apostles and of the Euangelists, vsed that diuersitie, that it might serue for a declaration and opening of the truth, and to the end that one Euangelist should serue to make the other to be vnderstood.

All the words of the Euangelists are true, not onely taken all together, but seuerally. The let vs first examine them seuerally and apart, and after that all together.

1 I say that the Gospell witnesseth, that Iesus Christ *tooke bread, that he blessed it, and that he brake it.* Then seeing that Iesus Christ tooke, and brake bread, how comes it that in the Church of Rome they say, that the Priest doth not breake bread? and that it is no more bread, when the breaking of the Sacrament is made?

2 The Gospell saith, that Iesus Christ *tooke bread, that he brake it, and that he gaue it.* Then it is true that he gaue bread, contrary to the Romish Church, which saith, that in the Masse the Priest giueth no bread. And note these words, *That Iesus Christ gaue bread*, which is not giuen but after consecration; it is bread therefore still after consecration.

3 And Saint *Matthew* witnesseth, that Iesus Christ *tooke bread, blessed it, brake it, and gaue it to his disciples, and said, Take, eate, this is my body.* Therefore we must beleeue, that the bread which Iesus Christ brake, and gaue, was his body, and not as the Church of Rome, which beleeueth that

it is no more bread, but onely the body of Iesus Christ, made by the conuersion of bread. He that will not be culpable of changing the words of the Gospell, ought constantly to hold these two truths set downe in the Gospel: the one, that Iesus Christ gaue bread; the other, that that bread which he gaue, was his body: and must not do as the Church of Rome doth, which vnder a pretence to lay hold on the second truth, ouerthroweth the first, and imagineth a transubstantiation whereby the bread is abolished.

4 These onely words, *This is my body*, whereon they build their doctrine, cannot beare vp the frame of Transubstantiation. For they are declaratiue words of that which is, and not effective of that which is not, and which presuppose that the same bread was already the bodie of the Lord before he pronounced these words.

5 And indeed both we and our aduersaries agree, that the bread is made the body of Christ by consecration, but consecration is not made by these words, *This is my body*, but by prayer and blessing which went before, as the Canon of the Church of Rome acknowledgeth, which beginneth *Corpus* * in the second Distinction of Consecration, and saith, *We call that the body and blood of Christ, which being taken from the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by mysticall prayer, is directly taken by vs for spirituall saluation, in memorie of the passion of our Lord.* And Pope *Innocent* the third in the fourth booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, cap. 6. saith, That Iesus Christ did not consecrate by these words, *This is my bodie*: but that he consecrated by his diuine vertue before he vttered those words. And * certainly reason confirmeth it: for we must be voyde of sense, if we know not, that to consecrate bread to God, we ought rather to speake to God then to the bread. But our aduersaries had rather go against reason, their owne Popes, and their Decrees, then obey the Gospell; placing consecration in these words, *This is my body*, by which the Priest speakes not to God, but to the bread.

6 Moreouer, no man can denie, that when Iesus Christ said, *This is my body*, but by that word *This*, he vnderstood that

* *Corpus & sanguinem Christi dicimus illud, quod de fructibus terræ acceptum & prece mystica sanctificatum, vtile sumimus ad salutem spiritualem in memoriam Dominicæ passionis.*

* Reade the booke of Capitefontium, which in the Preface saith, that *Innocent*, and *Catharius* and *Gabriel Biel*, and the ancient Fathers, are of opinion that consecration is made by prayer.

that which he held in his hands. Now both we & our aduerſaries acknowledge, that when Ieſus Chriſt pronounced the word *this*, he held nothing but bread in his hands. It followeth then that by the word *this*, he vnderſtood that bread: and by conſequence that theſe words, *This is my body*, ſignifie *This bread is my body*, and not, *Vnder theſe ſpecies is my body*. Nor *this ſhalbe tranſubſtantiated into my body*, as our aduerſaries vnderſtand it. The Decretall of the Romiſh Church ſaith as we ſay, that, *Panis eſt corpus Chriſti*, the bread is the body of Chriſt. *That which is ſeene* (ſaith the Canon) *is bread and a cup, as our eyes witneſſe. But touching the inſtruction which faith requireth, the bread is the body of Chriſt.*

2 *De conſecr. Can. Qui manducant. Quod videtur panis eſt & calix, quod etiam oculis renunciant, quod autem fides poſtulat inſtruenda, panis eſt corpus Chriſti.*

7 Sith therefore the ſence of theſe words, *This is my body*, is, *This bread is my body*, we muſt know how this bread can be the body of Ieſus Chriſt. Which he himſelfe declareth in all the words that follow, which we will particularly ſift and examine.

8 Ieſus Chriſt (as the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* ſaith) hauing ſaid, *This is my body*, addeth, *Which is broken for you.*

The bread of the holy Supper muſt needs be the body of Chriſt in the ſame manner that the body of Chriſt is broken in the holy Supper. But he is not therein really broken; for it is impoſſible: onely there he is ſacramentally broken: therefore in like ſort the bread is not really the body of Chriſt, but ſacramentally, and as the ſignes ordinarily take the names of the things by them ſignified, in the ſame manner as in the line following, the cup is called a Teſtament, as circumciſion is called the couenant of God, Gen. 17.9,10. As the Paſchall Lambe is called the paſſeouer, Exod. 12.11. and 21. 2. and 2. Chr. 30.15, &c. As the Arke is called the Eternall, 2. Sam. 6. 2. and Pſalme 24. becauſe it was a ſigne of the fauourable preſence of God amongſt his people. As the Apoſtle, 1. Cor. 10.4. ſaith, that *the rocke was Chriſt*, becauſe it was a figure of Ieſus Chriſt. The Scripture is full of ſuch exãples: it is the ordinary ſtyle thereof, to giue vnto the ſignes the names of thoſe things which they repreſent. And reaſon alſo alloweth it; for what is more naturall and proper, then in ſacraments to vſe

ſacramentall

cramentall words, and in an action which is figuratiue, to vſe a figure conformable to the action? to the end that by calling the ſignes by the names of thoſe things which they ſignifie, we may apprehend the vnion which the ſigne hath with the thing ſignified? becauſe God all at one time repreſenteth the ſignes vnto our eyes, and the thing ſignified vnto our faith.

To ſay that hereby we open a gap vnto hereſies, and thereby fauour the Marcionites, who in like manner might figuratiuely interpret theſe words of Saint *Iohn*, *The word was made fleſh*, is nothing to the purpoſe; for Saint *Iohn* in that place ſpeaketh not of a Sacrament: and therefore the ſacramentall manner of ſpeaking agrees not to that place. This imputation may iuſtly be layd vpon our aduerſaries themſelues, who to eſtabliſh their Tranſubſtantiation, wreſt and wring all the words of the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, and therein induce a dozen vnacceſtomed and prodigious figures, as hereafter we ſhall ſee.

To returne then to theſe words, *Which is broken for you*, we muſt vnderſtand that the Romiſh Churches tranſlation and the text of the Maſſe, haue corrupted this place, and haue tranſlated that in the future tenſe, which Ieſus Chriſt ſpake in the preſent tenſe, and haue put *ſhall be broken*, for *is broken*, *frangetur*, for *frangitur*: which tranſlation although it be good touching faith, yet it hindereth men from knowing that the purpoſe of Ieſus Chriſt is ſacramentall, and that the name of the thing ſignified is attributed to the ſigne.

9 Then to make the truth manifeſt, we aske our aduerſaries, whether the body of Ieſus Chriſt be really broken into pieces in the Euchariſt? or whether therein it be onely broken ſacramentally, and ſignificantly in a myſterie? If they ſay it is broken ſacramentally, then they are bound to interpret theſe words in the ſame manner, *This is my body*, and to ſay, that that which Ieſus Chriſt gaue to his Diſciples, was his ſacramentall body, and a remembrance of him. But if they will haue the body of our Lord to be really broken in the Maſſe, thereby they fall into three inconueniences: The firſt is, that they wrong Ieſus Chriſt, who being impaſſi-

ble,

ble, can no more be broken. The ſecond is, that they contradict their Maſſe and their Bible, which hath tranſlated, *and be broken*, in the future tenſe, becauſe there is no other reall breaking of the body of our Lord, but that which was to be done the next day vpon the croſſe. The third is, that they contradict themſelues: for the Church of Rome beleeueth, that the body of Ieſus Chriſt cannot be broken, and that when the Prieſt breaketh the hoſt, there is nothing but the accidents that are broken, and that the body of our Lord remaineth whole in euery piece thereof. So that it is a mockerie for them to ſay, that the body of our Lord is broken vnder the *ſpecies*, ſeeing they ſay that he remaineth whole vnder the *ſpecies*. That which remaineth whole vnder the *ſpecies*, is not broken vnder the *ſpecies*. Whereby they ſpeake as wiſely, as if I ſhould ſay, that a ſword is broken in the ſcabbard, when the ſcabbard onely is broken, and the ſword is whole and not broken.

Herein they ought to giue glory vnto God, and yeeld to the force of truth, and acknowledge, that ſeeing the body of Chriſt cannot be really broken in the Sacrament, that therein it is broken ſacramentally, in the ſame manner that the bread is the body of Chriſt. This breaking hath relation to that vpon the Croſſe, and taketh the name of that which it repreſenteth.

10 I ſay the ſame of the words which Saint *Luke* vſeth, *This is my body which is giuen for you*. For Ieſus Chriſt did not ſay, *This is my body which I giue you to eate*: but ſaid, *This is my body which is giuen for you*. Which words, *for you*, are as much as, *for your redemption*; which was really done vpon the croſſe, but is ſacramentally done in the Supper, and for a remembrance, as Ieſus Chriſt addeth, ſaying, *Do this in remembrance of me*.

Theſe words decide the queſtion. For if that which Ieſus Chriſt giueth, be the remembrance of Ieſus Chriſt, it is not Ieſus Chriſt: nothing is the remembrance of it ſelfe. And there is nothing ſo abſurd, as that which our aduerſaries ſay, * that in the Euchariſt Ieſus Chriſt is the figure and the remembrance

* *Bell. lib. 2. de Euchar. c. 24 Idem ſignum Chriſtus ſui figura ſui*

remembrance of himselfe; as if one should say, that the King is his picture, and that he is the image of himselfe. It is to no purpose to alledge diuers respects, and to say, that Iesus Christ in the Masse is the figure of Iesus Christ on the crosse. For whatsoeuer diuersitie of respects may be alledged, yet the King sitting at the table, shall neuer be the figure of himselfe on horsebacke. And if the King himselfe should represent one of his battels, yet he should not be the figure of himselfe; but his present action should be the figure of his action past. Adde hereunto, that visible things may be figures of inuisible things. But here they will haue Iesus Christ (inuisible in the Masse) to be the figure of Iesus Christ on the crosse where he was visible.

11 Beside, remembrance is of a thing past or absent, as *Aristotle* saith in his first * chapter of the booke of Memorie and Remembrance. So when the ancient Fathers called the tombes of Martyrs, remembrances, they shewed thereby, that those Martyrs were in heauen. And the Manna that was kept in the Arke, was not a remembrance of that portion of Manna that was in the Arke, but of the miraculous feeding of the people in the desart. And whosoeuer extolleth the valour of a King in his owne presence, doth not renew the remembrance of the Kings person that is present, but of his actions past. So to remember God, is to remember his maruellous workes, his promises, or his commandements. The same is to be found in all other examples.

* Ἡ δὲ μνήμη τῶν γινομένων, ἢ δὲ παρὸν ὅτε παρῆν ἦσαν, ἢ δὲ τὸ ἀπὸν ὅτε ἐφ' ἁ ἐστὶν ἡ μνημονεύσις.

It cannot be denied, that the holy Supper is a commemoration not onely of the person of Iesus Christ, but also of his death, seeing that the Apostle commandeth vs to eate that bread, to shew forth his death, 1. Cor. 11. 26. and Iesus Christ saith, *Do this in remembrance of me.*

Then we haue the exposition of these words, *This is my body*, giuen vs by Iesus Christ himselfe, that is, that *the bread which he gaue, was the remembrance of his body.*

12 Whereupon it is necessarie to set downe something, whereby to stop the mouthes of those that haue their spirits hardened, and are most resolute to contradict the truth. Then it

it is to be vnderſtood, that the language of the Iewes in the old Teſtament was the Hebrew tongue, which was ſtill called the Hebrew tõgue, although it fell from the purity thereof by mixing it with the Syrian tongue. In this Hebrew tongue the word *ſignifie* or *repreſent* is not found: but the ancient Hebrew Teſtament in ſtead of *ſignifie*, alwayes vſeth the word *is*. So *Ioſeph* in Geneſis 40. 12. interpreting the dreames of *Pharoes* cup-bearer and of his baker, ſaith, *The three branches of the vine are three dayes*; and in the 18. verſe, *Thee three baskets are three dayes*, that is, ſignifie three dayes: and in the 41. chapter, verſe 16. *The ſeuen fat kine are ſeuen yeeres, and the ſeuen full eares of corne are ſeuen yeeres. And the ſeuen leane euill-fauoured kine which came vp after the other, are ſeuen yeeres: and the ſeuen emptie eares of corne blaſted with the Eaſt winde, are ſeuen yeeres of famine.* And in foure places of that Chapter the word *are* is put for *ſignifie* or *repreſent*. So in Ezechiel 37. 11. *Theſe bones are the whole houſe of Iſrael*: to ſhew, that it was repreſented and figured by thoſe bones. And Daniel 2. 38. *It is thou ô King that art this head of gold*, in ſtead of ſaying, It is thou that art ſignified and prefigured by the head of gold. And 4. 20, 22. *The tree which thou ſaweſt, is thou ô King*. And 7. 17. *Theſe foure great beaſts, are foure kings*. And 21. verſe, *The ten hornes are ten kings*. And in the 8. chap. 20. and 21. verſes, *The ram which thou ſaweſt hauing two hornes, are the Kings of Media and Perſia: and the rough goate is the king of Grecia*. In all theſe places and many others, the word *are* is as much as to *ſignifie* or *repreſent*. From thence it comes, that although the Greeke tongue wanteth no words to ſay, *ſignifie*, *figure* or *repreſent*, yet the new Teſtament in Greeke, which oftentimes imitateth the Hebrew phraſe, ordinarily ſaith, *is* for *ſignifieth*. So the Apoſtle 1. Cor. 10. 4. ſpeaking of the rocke from whence water iſſued forth in the deſart, ſaith, that *the rocke was Chriſt*. And Galat. 4. 22, 24. it is ſaid, that the bond-ſeruant and the free, that is, *Agar* and *Sara*, are the two couenants: and Apocal. 17. 9, 18. *The ſeuen heads are ſeuen mountaines whereupon the woman ſitteth, and the woman which thou ſaweſt, is that great Citie*.

Then.

Then becauſe Ieſus Chriſt could not in his language ſay, *This ſignifieth or repreſenteth my body*, becauſe theſe words are not in the Hebrew tongue, he ſpake as the ſame language led him, and followed the manner of ſpeaking vſed among the Iewes, and perpetually in the holy Scripture. But foreſeeing that Satan by theſe words would plant idolatrie in the Church, he added, that that which he did was a remembrance: which is as much as if he had ſaid, *This is the remembrance of my body.*

13. Let vs follow the words of the inſtitution of this Sacrament, & let vs come to the ſecond part, which is the diſtribution of the wine. Matthew 26. 27. deſcribeth it in theſe words: *Alſo he tooke the cup, and when he had giuen thankes, he gaue it them, ſaying, Drinke ye alſo of it: for this is my bloud of the new Teſtament, that is ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſinnes.*

Saint *Luke* that wrote ſince, ſetteth downe theſe words in Chap. 22. 20. in this manner, *This cup is the new Teſtament in my bloud which is ſhed for you.* Saint *Paul* ſaith the ſame in 1. Cor. 11. 25.

Theſe two Pen-men of the Spirit of God, Saint *Paul* and Saint *Luke*, which wrote after the reſt, ſerue for expoſitors, & make a paraphraſe of the words of our Lord rehearſed by Saint *Matthew*: For it is to be preſuppoſed, that he which writeth after another, writeth not to obſcure him, but to expound and make him euident. It were a great abuſe to make Ieſus Chriſt to be the expounder of Saint *Pauls* words, ſeeing that S. *Paul* wrote expreſly to expound the words of Ieſus Chriſt, to cauſe the ſame to be vnderſtood.

Our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt hauing ſaid, that *the cup is his bloud*, the Apoſtle Saint *Paul* teacheth vs in what ſence that ought to be taken, that is, *This cup is the new Teſtament*, or *the new couenant in his bloud.*

Theſe words of Saint *Luke* and of Saint *Paul*, *This cup is the new Teſtament*, or *This cup is a new couenant*, (for the Greeke ſignifieth both the one and the other) leade vs directly to the knowledge of the truth.

14 For I demand of our aduerſaries, whether that which is

in

in the cup, be a couenant ſacramentally and in a ſignificant myſterie, or whether they will haue it to be the Teſtament & couenant of God in effect? If that which is in the cup be not really the couenant of God, but in a myſticall ſignification & ſacramẽtally, we muſt ſay, that that which Ieſus Chriſt brake & put into his diſciples hands, was not really the body of Ieſus Chriſt, but ſacramentally, and in a myſticall ſignification.

But if they will haue that which is in the cup really to be a couenant or a Teſtament, & the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt which they pretend to be in the cup to be a Teſtament, thereby they affirme that which themſelues beleeue not. 1. For wil they haue the wine to be tranſſubſtantiated into a couenant, or to become a Teſtament? 2. Can they ſpeake more abſurdly, then to ſay that the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt is a couenant or a Teſtament, ſeeing that a couenant and a Teſtament is a relation or an action, but the bloud of our Lord is a ſubſtance? 3. A Teſtament conſiſteth in clauſes and promiſes, which agreeth not with the bloud of Chriſt. 4. What an abſurditie is it, to call Ieſus Chriſt a Teſtament, ſeeing he is the teſtator, or to call him a couenant, ſeeing the couenant is betweene him and vs? 5. If one of the parties contracting may be called the couenant, the faithfull alſo may be called the couenant, becauſe the couenant is contracted with them. 6. If the bloud of our Lord be the couenant and Teſtament, the Prieſt (as they ſay) making the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, euery day maketh the couenant of God, and the Teſtament of Ieſus Chriſt. But the couenant of God is no more made, it is eternall, and the Teſtament of the Sonne of God is not reiterable; and to apply the ſame we muſt not make it. 7. Beſides, if the bloud of our Lord in the cup be really the new Teſtament, then it followes, that the new Teſtament began at that time, which notwithſtanding was before. For before the inſtitution of this Sacrament, the Goſpell was already preached, which beareth this inſcription, *The new Teſtament.* And Baptiſme alſo was then already inſtituted, which is a Sacrament of the new Teſtament. 8. And Saint *Matthew* ſaith, that *That which is in the cup, is the bloud of the new Teſtament*; then it followeth, that that bloud is not

the

the new Testament. For as *Philips* cloake is not *Philip* himselfe, so the bloud of the new Testament, is not the new Testament it selfe. And yet our aduersaries, fully hardened in errour, obstinately maintaine, that the bloud of the Lord which they say is in the cup, is truly and really a couenant, and that the wine is transsubstantiated into a couenant.

Howbeit truth is so strong that it makes them say the truth when they thinke not of it. For they say, that the cup is called the couenant, because that by the cup the couenant is confirmed, and that it is the seale thereof; which is the same that we say, & by which we proue that the cup is not the couenant really, but the Sacrament thereof: for the confirmation of a thing is not the thing it selfe, and a seale set vpon a letter, is not the letter it selfe. So that against their wils they yeeld vnto vs. For seeing that the cup is called the couenant, because it is the seale thereof, by the same reason the bread also must be called the body of Christ, because it is the seale and the confirmation thereof, which is our beliefe. For the Sacraments are seales, as Saint *Paul*, Rom. 4. calleth circumcision, *The seale of the righteousnesse of faith*, although in it there was no transsubstantiation.

16 And in saying that the cup is the seale of the couenant, they confesse (against their wils,) that the cup is not really the bloud of Iesus Christ. For the seales and confirmations of a couenant, and the signatures of a Testament, ought to be visible and exposed vnto our senses: but the bloud in the cup is inuisible. For it is not onely hidden vnder the accidents & apparence of wine, but it is also hidden in the body: for our aduersaries say, that the body is in the cup, and that the bloud which is in the cup, is in the veines of the body in its naturall places.

17 And if these things were not as cleare as the Sunne, yet the words that follow, are strong enough to force those that are most obstinate, to yeeld, and to make such as are wilfully blind, to see the truth. For the Gospell saith, *This cup is the new Testament in my bloud.*

These words, *in my bloud*, cleare the point, and manifestly shew,

ſhew, That that which is in the cup, is not really the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt. For ſay that by *this cup*, we muſt vnderſtand *this bloud*, and let vs ſee what will enſue thereof. Is not this to make the words of our Lord ridiculous, to make him ſay, *This bloud is the new Teſtament in my bloud?* What? is that bloud of Ieſus Chriſt in the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt? Muſt wee by this meanes make two ſorts of bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, as * *Bellarm.* doth, for feare of putting the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt into the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt? For it is certaine, That that which is in a thing, whether it be contained therein, whether it be infuſed therein, or whether it be adherent therein, is not one ſelfſame thing with that thing. For ſeeing, that the Goſpell witneſſeth that *Calix eſt in ſanguine Chriſti*, it ſaith euidently, that *Calix non eſt ſanguis Chriſti*: a cup which is in the bloud of Chriſt is not really the bloud of Chriſt, but ſacramentally, and by commemoration, as it is added.

* *Bell. lib. 1. de Euchar. cap. 11. §. Ad quartum. Sanguis accipitur duobus modis in his duobus locis.*

18 Our aduerſaries charged with ſo many abſurdities, defend themſelues by impiety, which caſteth them headlong into other abſurdities. They ſay, that there is mention made of two ſorts of bloud of Ieſus Chriſt, wherof the one is a Cup, the other was ſhed vpon the Croſſe; whereof the one was powred vpon the other, and wherof the one is the Teſtamẽt, and the other not, but ſtill it is the ſame bloud. If theſe ſeuerall reſpects ſhould make ſeuerall blouds of Chriſt, there would be a thouſand ſorts of bloud, one at the table, another in the ſhip, and another after the reſurrection, &c. And if the bloud in the Cup hath the honour to be the couenant, why ſhould we depriue the bloud of the croſſe of that honour? Then to effect this, they muſt forge two ſorts of couenants, and by that meanes creepe among thornes as ſnakes do, and couer themſelues with a thouſand wreſted deuices againſt the force of truth.

19 Saint *Mathew* addeth, *This bloud*, or as Saint *Luke* and Saint *Paul* ſay, *This cup is ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſinnes.*

The vnderſtanding of theſe words depends vpon thoſe that went before; for ſeeing we haue proued that the Lord giueth

to the ſignes the names of the things ſignified, it is agreeable to reaſon, that as the Cup is the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt ſacramentally, ſo it ſhould bee ſhed ſacramentally. For you muſt note, that the Euangeliſts ſay, *is ſhed*, and ſpeake in the preſent tenſe, ſaying, *effunditur*, and not *effundetur*, as the Maſſe and the Romiſh tranſlation ſay. For although that this ſacramentall ſhedding of the bloud of Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſins, hath relation to the effuſion vpon the croſſe, yet we ought to tranſlate the words faithfully. Alſo the tranſlation in the preſent tenſe doth hinder vs from knowing that our Sauiours intent was ſacramentall, and that the name of the thing ſignified is attributed to the ſigne.

20 Herein our Aduerſaries are much troubled. For if this ſhedding be ſacramentall and a commemoration, wee haue wonne our cauſe: and the Doctors of the Romiſh Church are on our ſide, who hauing gloſſed vpon the Decretall in the 2. Diſtinction of Conſecration, ſay, *Sanguis effunditur, id eſt, effundi ſignificatur*, The bloud is ſhed, that is, it is ſignified or repreſented that the bloud is ſhed. The Maſſe it ſelfe alſo, tranſlating in the future tenſe *effundetur*, ſhall be ſhed, leadeth vs the right way; for it giueth vs to vnderſtand, that the effuſion which the Lord made in the Sacrament, was a ſignification and a repreſentation of the effuſion which was to be made the next day vpon the Croſſe.

Cant. 5. Quo-tieſcunque.

21 Yet our Aduerſaries contend with vs herein, and affirme, that the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt is really and effectually ſhed in the Euchariſt. But if you aske them, whether in the Euchariſt the bloud iſſueth out of the body, or out of the veines, they ſay, no, and ſo contradict themſelues, and confeſſe that the bloud is not really ſhed. They themſelues call the Euchariſt a Sacrifice without bloud; which ſhould be falſe if therein bloud were really ſhed. They alſo contradict themſelues when they ſay, that the bloud of our Lord ſtirreth not in the Euchariſt, nor moueth, and yet it is ſhed therein, for all ſhedding is a mouing.

22 In this perplexity their onely refuge is, neuer to anſwer any thing to the purpoſe. For being asked, whether the

the bloud of our Lord is shed in the Masse, they say it is shed vnder the *species*. But we aske them not, vnder what thing the bloud is shed, but whether it be shed therein or no? Adde hereunto, that the bloud which commeth not out of the body vnder the *species*, and which stirreth not from vnder the *species*, is not shed vnder the *species*.

23 They say, that the accidents which they call *species*, are shed, which is a capricious kinde of Philosophy, to imagine that the Priest powreth out liues, taste, and colour of wine without wine, and that the bloud is shed without issuing out of the body. So that the Priest filleth out and drinketh bones, flesh, and a liquid and potable humane body, which is whole in euery drop of the wine.

24 The Lord concludeth his intent by a clause which definitiuely decideth the controuersie, saying, Matth. 26. 29. *I say vnto you, I will not drinke henceforth of this fruite of the Vine.* Saint *Marke* saith the like. Our Lord could not more plainly say, that it was the fruite of the Vine which he dranke, & not bloud. For the fruite of the vine and wine are all one thing. It is true that Saint *Luke* speaketh of two cuppes, one of the paschall Lambe, the other of the holy Supper, and witnesseth also, that Iesus Christ called the cuppe of the paschall Lambe the fruite of the Vine. But Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Marke* speake onely of the cup of the Eucharist, which they call the fruit of the Vine. Surely it cannot be said, that they call the wine of a Cup whereof they speak not at all, the fruit of the Vine. Then to make the Euangelists to agree, wee must necessarily say, that Iesus Christ spake twice of the fruit of the Vine, & that administring the cup of the Eucharist, he repeated the same termes. For it were an intolerable boldnes to correct Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Marke* by Saint *Luke*, and to charge them to haue troubled the order and method of our Sauiours words in so important an action, whereat Saint *Mathew* himselfe was present. Pope *Innocent* the third, in the fourth booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, 27. Chapter, acknowledgeth, that Iesus Christ called that the fruite of the Vine which he consecrated in the Cup.

Quod autem vinum in sanguine consecrauit, patet ex eo quod ipse subiunxit, non bibam à modo de genimine, &c.

Being put from that, they haue another refuge, and say, that the wine is called the fruite of the Vine, in regard that it was so before. As if wee should call a man of fifty yeeres of age a child, because onee he was a child: and ripe grapes verjuice, because they haue beene so. This is to say, that a thing is that which it is not. The examples by them alledged of *Moses* Rod, that was called a Rod after it was changed into a Serpent; and of the water, called water after it was changed into wine, Iohn 2. 9. are to no purpose. For that Serpent had been a Rod, and that wine had beene water; but the bloud of Christ neuer was wine. And that Rod was turned into a Serpent, which it was not before. But here they will haue this wine to be turned into bloud, which was so already before the conuersion. Adde hereunto, that such a figure is repugnant to the nature of a Sacrament, which requireth that the name of the thing signified should be giuen vnto the signe, and not that the name of the signe should be giuen to the thing signified. When we call the wine, bloud, we speake according to the custome and nature of Sacraments; but when wee call the bloud of our Lord wine, or the fruite of the Vine, we ouerthrow the nature of the Sacrament, and embase the thing signified; and to shunne a naturall and vsuall figure in these words, *This is my body*, induce a figure against nature, which is not vsuall, in these words, *I will drinke no more of this fruite of the Vine.*

Proofes thereof by the circumstances of the action.

26. Sect. All the circumstances of the action speake for, and fight with vs against transsubstantiation. For, as Iesus Christ made no lifting vp of the host, so he did not command the Apostles to worship that which he held in his hands; and it is certaine that they sate at the Table, which is an vnfit action for those that adore. For if at this day any one should do as the Apostles then did, he should be held among them to be a prophane

prophane fellow, and a contemner of God. It is to no purpose to say, that the Apostles had Iesus Christ daily with them: for they did neuer eate him, nor swallowed him downe into their stomacks, nor euer were present at such a sacrifice. And such an adoration had been necessary in the first institution of that Sacrament, and in the action which was to serue for a patterne and president in time to come.

2 The time also when the Lord celebrated that action, is very necessarie to be considered. For then his body was weake and passible, but the body which they will haue Iesus Christ to haue giuen to his Disciples, was impassible, and could not be broken: as being whole in euery crumme, and spirituall and indiuisible. And there can no example be found, wherein a body is weake and passible in one place, and impassible and without infirmity in another place. Contrary things may agree in one selfe same subiect at seuerall times, or in seuerall parts of the subiect, or in diuers respects, that is, being compared to diuers things: As for example, a man may be white to day, and the next day blacke; he may be white in one part of his body, and black in another; he may be rich in comparison of one that is poorer, and poore in comparison of one that is richer. But that a man at one and the same time, and all together, not compared to another, can be white and blacke, or poore and rich, it is impossible. Now this is it which they do to the body of Christ, which they make, all together, at the same time, and without comparing it to any other, to be mortall and immortall, passible and impassible, weake and without infirmitie, visible and inuisible, speaking and mouing it selfe at the Table, and not speaking nor being able to moue vnder the *species* of bread. Thus you haue two contrary Iesus Christs: and one Iesus Christ more perfect then himselfe: for to be impassible is a perfection, and to be passible is an imperfection.

3 They agree with vs, that Iesus Christ in the Eucharist did eate & drinke with his disciples. Whence it followeth (according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome) that Iesus Christ did eat himselfe, and that he swallowed his whole bo-

die downe into his ſtomacke. And ſeeing that naturally Ieſus Chriſts mouth ſtood in his head, by this doctrine we muſt ſay, that at one ſelfeſame time he had his mouth in his head, and his head in his mouth. And yet he did not eate himſelfe as he was: for when Ieſus Chriſt did eate, he was weake, and Ieſus Chriſt eaten by Ieſus Chriſt, was without infirmity. Which being a greater miracle then the conception and the reſurrection of Ieſus Chriſt, yet they can produce no fruite thereby, nor ſhew vs how that can profit vs touching our redemption. And if Ieſus Chriſt did that to ſerue for an example to the Prieſt, then it followeth that the Prieſt ſhould eate himſelfe in the Maſſe. And it is hard to ſay, what the body of Ieſus Chriſt did in the body of Ieſus Chriſt, and what efficacie it had therein. And ſeeing that they ſay, that the ſoule is within the hoſt, to what end ſhould Chriſts ſoule enter into Chriſt, ſeeing it was there already? Do our aduerſaries thinke to be beleeued in all theſe things? Is not this the way to paint the Houſe of God with *Chimeraes*, and to expoſe religion to open obloquie?

4 It is alſo to be noted, that our aduerſaries hold, with S. *Auguſtine* and Saint *Hierome*, that *Iudas* receiued the Euchariſt with the reſt of the Apoſtles. And indeed Saint *Luke*, after the adminiſtration of the Sacrament, witneſſeth that Ieſus Chriſt ſaid, *Behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me, is with me at the table*. But it is manifeſt, that the body of Ieſus Chriſt did not enter into *Iudas*: for the Goſpell witneſſeth that *Iudas* being at the table, the diuell entred into him. Ieſus Chriſt and the diuell could not well haue lodged both together, ſeeing that the deuill preuailed in *Iudas*; and ſo it muſt follow that the diuell got the vpper hand of Ieſus Chriſt. But Ieſus Chriſt dwelleth not in any man without producing the effects of ſaluation in him. *Whoſoeuer eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath life eternall*, Ioh. 6. 54.

5 It is a notable circũſtance to be conſidered, that Ieſus Chriſt celebrating the Euchariſt, was troubled, as now entring into his paſſion; and when he roſe from the table, he ſaid that his ſoule was very heauy, euen vnto the death, and ſweet drops

of

of bloud for griefe. And yet at one selfe same time, our aduersaries make one Iesus Christ to be in the mouthes and stomackes of the Apostles, which being impassible suffered no paine nor griefe, neither sweat drops of bloud; which not onely makes two contrary Iesus Christs at one time, but also one Iesus Christ which is not our Sauiour, seeing he is exempted from passions.

6 Lastly, it is to be thought, that the bread being broken in so many pieces among the Apostles, some crums or small pieces there of did fall downe, and that there was some substance, yet Iesus Christ did not command them to take vp nor to reserue the rest, which he would haue done, if euery crum and piece there of had been Iesus Christs body fully and wholly.

7 But say that there was no bread remaining, yet the Apostles in the meane time that Iesus Christ was vpon the Crosse, or in the sepulcher, might among themselues celebrate the Sacrament: and so there should be one Iesus Christ vpon the Crosse, with his hands and feete pierced with nayles and tormented, and another not on the crosse, that had not his hands and his feete pierced, neither suffered any torment. And if in the host Iesus Christ is also crucified and whipt, then they must put the crosse, and the executioners, and the whips into the host, or else they must say that he was crucified vnder the host without the crosse, and whipped without whips, which are apparent contradictions.

Other places of Scripture touching this matter.

The onely institution of this holy Sacrament may suffice to ouerthrow their errors, and to confirme and establish the truth: yet you shall see a number of places more out of the Scripture touching this matter; which we will set downe.

1 The Apostle Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 11. 26. hauing declared the institution of the holy Supper, addeth: *For as often as yee*

eate this bread, and drinke this cup, ye do shew the Lords death till he come. Wherefore whosoeuer shall eate this bread, and drinke this cup of the Lord vnworthily, shall be guiltie of the body and bloud of the Lord. But let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of this bread, and drinke of the cup. This excellent Apostle three times in this one place saith, that wee eate bread. Now it is not eaten but after consecration. This shewe wee then, That that which Iesus Christ said to be his body, was still bread, in the sence and for the reasons aforesaid.

Therefore our aduersaries if, who the Apostle three times in one place saith, that wee eate bread, whether the word bread ought to be taken properly and without a figure, or whether it ought to be taken figuratiuely for the body of Iesus Christ? If it be taken properly, we are satisfied, and so it is bread still after consecration. But if they will affirme that S. *Paul* three times together spake figuratiuely, so that we must expound the figuratiue words of Saint *Paul* by Iesus Christs words, *this is my body*, therein they manifestly discouer their vnfaithfull dealing. For they know that Iesus Christ is not an expounder of the Apostles words, but that the Apostles are expositors of Iesus Christs words. Now who ought to speake more clearly, either he that is expounded, or he that expoundeth? He that spake first and briefly, or he that speaketh after him and more at large? Specially considering we see that Iesus Christ in saying, *This is my body*, did sufficiently expound himselfe; but Saint *Paul* saying three times one after another, that we eate bread, addeth no exposition. And if by this word *bread* so many times rehearsed by the Apostle wee must vnderstand flesh, should not the same Apostle be culpable of holding the people in an error, and of digging a ditch to make them to fall into it; seeing hee knew that sense and reason witnesse that it is bread, whose reports men naturally beleeue?

But seeing that our aduersaries turne all things into figures, let vs see how they expound those figures: they will haue the body of our Lord to be called bread, because it was bread before consecration. Which is false, for Christs body neuer was

bread.

bread. Beſides, it is more conuenient to call things by thoſe names which they are, then by thoſe things which they are not any more. And if there be a place or two in the Scripture where that is found, there are thouſands that call things that which they are, and not that which they haue been. 2. Alſo they ſay, that Saint *Paul* ſaith, that *we eate bread*, inſtead of ſaying, that we eate the body of Chriſt, becauſe it ſeemeth to be bread. That alſo is falſe, for the body of our Lord neuer ſeemed to be bread. It is true, that our aduerſaries ſay, that the body of our Lord is couered ouer with the *ſpecies* of bread: but men neuer giue to things that are couered, the names of thoſe things which couer them; we call not a ſcabbard a ſword, we neuer ſay that a man is a cheſt, although he ſhould be hidden in a Cheſt.

Neuertheleſſe the contempt of this ſacred bread redoundeth to the diſhonour of Ieſus Chriſt: and as when men tread the Kings great Seale vnder their feete, the King and not the waxe is diſhonoured thereby: ſo to prophane this bread, is to prophane the Sonne of God: Therefore he which receiueth it vnworthily, receiueth his owne condemnation, becauſe he diſcerneth not the body of our Lord. They would make the Apoſtle to ſay, that ſuch a one doth not diſcerne that it is the body of our Lord which he hath eaten: whereas the ſence of the Apoſtles words is, that ſuch an one doth not diſcerne the body of our Lord which he hath wronged and diſhonoured.

2 In Acts 2.46. it is ſaid, that the diſciples *did breake bread from houſe to houſe*. And Acts 20.7. *When the diſciples came together to breake bread*: which place our aduerſaries confeſſe, is meant of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. They therefore who denie that they did there breake bread, will be wiſer then the Apoſtles, and condemne the words of the Spirit of God, which at this day would be ridiculous. For which of our aduerſaries would endure a Prieſt, that in ſtead of ſaying, *I goe to ſing Maſſe*, ſhould ſay, *I go to breake bread*? Here alſo our aduerſaries find another figure, and by the word bread, will haue vs to vnderſtand *fleſh*.

3. In

3 In 1. Corinth. 10. 16. the Apoſtle ſaith, *The bread which we breake, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt?* There alſo he ſaith, that we breake bread: and it appeareth that by the bread he vnderſtandeth true bread, and not the body of Chriſt, becauſe he ſaith the bread is broken. The body of Chriſt cannot be broken: it is not broken vnder the *ſpecies*, if it remaineth whole vnder the *ſpecies*. Beſides he ſaith, that this bread is the communion of the body of Chriſt; but the body of Chriſt is not the communion of the body of Chriſt. It muſt then be bread: and when wee breake that bread, we participate in the body of Chriſt, vnleſſe we will giue the Apoſtle the lye thrice in one line, by ſaying, that it is no bread but fleſh; that this fleſh is not broken, and that it is not the communion of the body of Chriſt, but the body of Chriſt it ſelfe. The communion of the body is not without the body, but yet it doth not hence follow, that the communion of the body is the body. In a flame of fire, the brightnes is not without the heate, yet the brightneſſe is not the heate.

4 In Acts 3. 21. Saint *Peter* ſaith, *Whom the heauen muſt containe vntill the time of reſtitution of all things.* The Greeke word ſometimes ſignifieth *containe*, & ſometimes *receiue*, but here it cannot be taken for *receiue*. For it is falſe that the heauen receiueth Ieſus Chriſt vntill the day of Iudgement. He hath been once receiued therein, and there is contained for euer; and if he be contained there, he is no more on earth.

δέχεσθαι. as alſo *capere* in Latine.

5 Ieſus Chriſt, in Saint Iohn 17. 11. being ready to leaue the world to go vnto his Father, ſpeaketh as being alreadie departed out of the world, ſaying, *And now I am no more in the world.* And 16. 18. *I leaue the world and go to my Father.* And 12. 8. *For the poore ye haue alwayes with you, but me ye haue not alwayes.* *Iohn* 13. 1. he ſaith, *That his houre was come that he ſhould depart out of this world vnto his Father.* Here Ieſus Chriſt declareth that he is no more in the world, that he leaueth the world, and that we ſhould not alwayes haue him with vs. Theſe ſpeeches diſlike the Church of Rome, for ſhe will haue vs to haue Ieſus Chriſt alwaies with vs, yea that he ſhould now be much more on earth, then he was when he

he liued here on earth in his infirmity: for then he was but in one place at one time, but now they will haue him to be in a thouſand places all at one time; and not onely that his body ſhould be here among men, but alſo in the power of men, who keepe it vnder locke and key, for feare of mice, or leſt it ſhould be ſtolne away.

They make anſwer and ſay, that in theſe places Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, that he is not viſibly in the world, that he leaueth the world, and that we ſhall not haue him alwayes as touching his viſible preſence. This is a kinde of mockery. For to haue Ieſus Chriſt inuiſibly, is alwayes to haue Ieſus Chriſt: and to be alwayes preſēt inuiſibly, is not to leaue the world. He lieth that ſaith he hath no money, becauſe his money is hidden in his pocket; or he that ſhould ſay that he hath no ſoule, becauſe his ſoule is inuiſible. He that is in Paris, and hideth himſelfe in a place where no man can ſee him, cannot therefore be ſaid that he is not in Paris.

But there is nothing that more euidently confuteth this euaſiō, then the promiſe of Ieſus Chriſt made to his Apoſtles, Iohn 14. 15. whereby hee promiſeth them, that going from them, he would for a recompence, and for their comfort, ſend them the holy Ghoſt, whom he calleth the Comforter. Certainly, if Ieſus Chriſt is really preſent vnder the *ſpecies* in the holy Supper, our Lord could and would haue comforted them otherwiſe touching his abſence, by ſaying, You ſhall no more haue me preſent touching my viſible preſence, but I will be really preſent vnder the bread, in your mouthes and in your ſtomackes, in ſuch manner that I will be much more preſent and neerer vnto you, then I was during my viſible conuerſation here on earth.

6 Theſe conſiderations put vs in minde of the propheticall aduertiſement of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt giuen, Matth. 24. 24. ſaying, There ſhall ariſe falſe prophets and falſe Chriſts, who ſhall ſhew great ſignes and wonders, and ſhall ſay, Behold, Chriſt is here, or he is there, or that he is in the ſecret chambers; whom he forbiddeth vs to beleeue. Then when our aduerſaries ſay, there is Chriſt in the hoſt, or that God goeth

by,

by, or that he is in the pixe, or in a chamber vnder locke and key, and that thereupon men tell vs of miracles, we admire the Prophetical words of the Sonne of God, and adore his Iudgements, touching the hardening of mens hearts.

A briefe and certaine exposition of these words:
This is my body.

28. *Sect.* Out of all that which is said before, it is an easie matter to set downe a briefe and certaine exposition of these words, *This is my body*, drawne out of the most expresse words of the Scripture.

The vnderstanding of these words depends vpon the right and true exposition of the word *This*, and of the exposition of the words, *my body*.

By the word *This*, it is out of question that Iesus Christ vnderstood that which he brake and gaue to his disciples, and that which he commanded them to eate. The Gospell witnesseth that Iesus Christ brake bread, *He tooke bread, and blessed it, and brake it.* And Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 10, 16. saith: *The bread which we breake.* And Acts 20. 7. *Being come together to breake bread.* And the Gospell witnesseth that Iesus Christ gaue bread, *He tooke bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gaue it.* The Apostle Saint *Paul* also, 1. Cor. 11. witnesseth that it is bread that we eate, saying, *When you shall eate of this bread.* And againe, *But let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread.* Then the sence of the word *This*, is thus; *The bread which I breake, and giue you to eate.*

And by consequence, these words, *This is my bodie*, are as much to say as, *this bread which I breake, and giue you to eate, is my body.* Which proposition being not true, if it be taken in the literall sence, seeing that bread is not really and actually the body of Christ, it is certaine that in these words there is a figure.

Now

Now to know what this figure is, we muſt learne it by the words following, which Ieſus Chriſt addeth, ſaying, *Do this in remembrance of me*: And by the nature of the preſent action, which is a Sacrament and a ſacred ſigne, to the which by conſequence ſacramentall phraſes are conuenient. They are called ſacramentall phraſes, when the ſigne is called by the name of the thing ſignified, in the ſame manner that in the line following the Cup is called the couenant: becauſe it is a ſigne and a Sacrament of the couenant. Which is the vſuall manner of ſpeaking in the Scripture, as we haue ſhewed before.

This then is the expoſition of theſe words, *This is my body*, gathered out of the Scripture: *The bread which I breake, and which I giue you to eate, is the remembrance of my body.*

Which expoſition whoſoeuer reiecteth, reſiſteth ſo many expreſſe places of the Scripture, and againſt the nature of a Sacrament; and to auoyd a figure ſimple, naturall and vſuall in the Scripture and conuenient for the preſent action, induceth a multitude of vnaccuſtomed figures, without any example, and contrary to the nature of a Sacrament, as we will ſhew: And ſo affirmes, that Ieſus Chriſt did eate himſelfe, that the body of our Lord and the diuell both at one time entred into *Iudas*: And that the Lord had a mortall body which ſate at the table with his diſciples, and that at the very ſame time he had a body without infirmity, and impaſſible in the mouthes and ſtomakes of the Apoſtles: which obſtinacie of men reſolued to erre, God hath puniſhed with ſuch blindneſſe, that they are come euen to beleeue that rats or mice can eate the body of our Lord, now when he is in heauen ſitting at the right hand of God.

With what liberty our aduerſaries forge figures, and wreſt the words of Ieſus Chriſt and of the Apoſtles.

Sect. 29. Our aduerſaries exclaime againſt vs, becauſe wee take theſe words, *This is my body*, in a figuratiue ſence: although the figure which we make therein is ordinary, and perpetuall in the Scripture touching matter of Sacraments, and in regard that Ieſus Chriſt could ſpeake no otherwiſe, for that in his language there is not a word whereby he could ſay, *This repreſenteth or ſignifieth my body*: as alſo that Ieſus Chriſt expoundeth himſelfe, ſaying, that it is a remembrance; and for that all the action, and all the words of the inſtitution, and all the expoſitions added by the Apoſtles, enforce vs to vnderſtand it ſo, as we haue already ſhewed.

Notwithſtanding they themſelues, to ſhun this vſuall and naturall figure for the preſent action, forge a multitude of vnaccuſtomed figures contrary to the nature of the action, and there is not one word found in the Scripture touching this matter, to the which in a manner they giue not a blow, and wherein they do not forge ſome figure, which marres the ſence, and corrupteth the doctrine.

1 In theſe words, *This is my body*, they ſay that by the word *this*, we muſt vnderſtand *vnder theſe ſpecies*, and that *this*, is an *individuum vagum*, which ſignifieth no certaine thing, and whereof the ſence hangeth in ſuſpence, vntill ſuch time as the words are fully pronounced.

2 They alſo ſay, that by the word *is*, we muſt vnderſtand *ſhall be*, for they ſay that tranſſubſtantiation is not done till the words are pronounced.

3 In theſe words, *He tooke the cup, ſaying, This cup is the new couenant*, they ſay that the word *cup*, is a word of two ſignifications, and that the firſt time the word *cup* ſignifieth the wine, and in ſecond time it ſignifieth the bloud.

4 So

4 So when Saint *Matthew* ſaith, *This is my bloud, the bloud of the new Teſtament*, by the word *Teſtament*, they vnderſtand the couenant of God. But when Saint *Luke* and Saint *Paul* ſay, *This cup is the new Teſtament in my bloud*, they will haue the Teſtament to be Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe, and that the Teſtament and the teſtator ſhould be all one.

5 In theſe words, *This cup is the new Teſtament in my bloud*, they will haue vs by the *cup* to vnderſtand the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, and by the words *my bloud*, wee muſt vnderſtand the bloud ſhed vpon the croſſe, making another bloud of Ieſus Chriſt to be powred into the bloud of Ieſus Chriſt.

6 And when Chriſt calleth that which he dranke, the fruit of the vine, they ſay, that by the fruit of the vine we muſt vnderſtand the bloud, becauſe it was wine before the conuerſion, or becauſe it hath an apparence thereof.

7 For the ſame reaſons, when Saint *Paul* three times one after the other ſaith, that we eate bread, they will haue the word bread to ſignifie the body of Chriſt.

8 And when Saint *Paul* ſaith, *The bread that wee breake, is the communion of the body of Chriſt*, they ſay, that by the bread we muſt vnderſtand the body, and deny that the bread is broken, becauſe the body (as they ſay) remaineth whole in euery piece of the hoſt.

9 So when Ieſus Chriſt ſo many times declareth, that he leaueth the world, and that he will be no more in the world, they adde, *viſibly*, & ſo by the addition of one word, they corrupt and peruert the meaning of many places of the Scripture.

10 And when the Lord, Ioh. 6. 51. ſaith, *That if any man eateth his fleſh, he ſhall liue for euer*, they plainly perceiue, that if in thoſe words Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh of the participation of the Sacrament, it muſt of force follow, that *Iudas* & diuers hypocrites which did and do participate therein, ſhall liue for euer: which to auoyde, they adde to the Lords words and ſay, that his meaning is, that if a man eateth the fleſh of the Lord worthily, he ſhall liue for euer. But we maintaine that

a man cannot eate the fleſh of our Lord vnworthily, ſeeing that it cannot be eaten but onely ſpiritually and in faith, which cannot be done vnworthily. It is true that the Scripture ſpeaketh of eating the bread vnworthily, but not of eating the fleſh of our Lord vnworthily.

11 So when in the 53. verſe the Lord ſaith, *Except yee eate the fleſh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, ye haue no life in you*; they plainly ſee, that if there it is ſpoken of the holy Sacrament, the good thiefe, and many faithfull perſons which died, and die without hauing meanes of participating therein, ſhall be excluded from euerlaſting life. Therefore here they adde a piece, and tell vs, that Ieſus Chriſts intent was to ſay, *If you eate not my fleſh, when you haue meanes to doe it, ye ſhall not haue life eternall.* But the ſentence of our Lord is true, ſimply and without exception. For whoſoeuer eateth not the fleſh of our Lord in faith, hath not life eternall.

12 And when our Lord ſaith, *If you drinke not my bloud, you ſhall not haue life eternall*, that they may not by this ſentence be bound to miniſter the Cup to the people, they ſay, that by the word *drinke*, the Lord vnderſtood *to take it without drinking*, becauſe the bloud alſo is in the hoſt.

Now where are theſe men, that are ſo great enemies to figures, and which ſticke ſo faſt and ſcrupulouſly to the letter? But therein they thinke they haue a priuiledge: for they ſay that the Church of Rome cannot erre in her interpretations: and therefore the Gloſſe vpon the Decretals boldly ſaith, that the Pope *may diſpenſe againſt the Apoſtle, and againſt the old Teſtament, yea and that he diſpenſeth with the Goſpell, giuing it interpretation.*

* *Tit. 8. De conceſſ. Prebend cap. Propoſuit in Gloſſa. Papa contra Apoſtolum diſpenſat: Item contra vetus Teſtamentum. Et Diſt. 34. Can. Lector. Papa. poteſt contra Apoſtolum diſpenſare. Et Cauſa 25. Quæſt. 1. Can. Sunt quidam. Diſpenſat in Euangelio interpretando ipſum.*

That

That Tranſſubſtantiation ouerthroweth the humanitie of Ieſus Chriſt, and expoſeth it to great opprobrie and diſgrace.

The worſt miſchiefe is, that by this doctrine the humanity of Ieſus Chriſt is aboliſhed, and the dignity of Prieſts exalted, contrary to the honour of the Sonne of God. This of all others is a principall hereſie. For to ouerthrow the humane nature of Ieſus Chriſt, is to cut the band in twaine which vniteth vs to God, & a ſtopping of the pipe whereby God maketh his celeſtiall benefits to fall downe vpon vs. God acknowledgeth vs to be his children, for no other reaſon but becauſe we are brethren to his Sonne. But we ſhould not be brethren to the Sonne of God, if he were not a man as we are, and had not a humane nature like vnto ours. He was content to participate with our humane nature, that we might be partakers of his diuine nature, & to put on our fleſh, to clothe vs with his Spirit. That is it which the Apoſtle, Hebrewes 2. 17. ſaith, *Wherefore in all things it behoued him to be made like vnto his brethren.* And 4. 15. *He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without ſinne:* that he might be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and that hauing a brother which is inheritor of the kingdome of heauen, we might be coheires with him by vertue of that alliance. 30. Sect.

This doctrine of Tranſſubſtantiation then vndermineth piety at the very root, and wounds religion at the heart.

1 For Ieſus Chriſt hath not a true humane body, if the parts of his body be not different in ſituation, and if in euery part of the hoſt his body be whole, ſo that his head and his feete are in the whole hoſt, and his head and his feet in euery particular part thereof.

2 To take from a body thoſe things whereby it differeth from a ſpirit, is to make it no more a body but a ſpirit. But by tranſſubſtantiation the body of our Lord is bereft of all the

properties and differences whereby a body is distinguished fro a spirit. For vnder the *species* they make it to be without space, and without circumscription, hauing no place, no measure, nor space, nor parts or members situated apart in their places.

3 And as in a point there is neither length nor breadth, whosoeuer placeth an humane body all whole vnder an indiuisible point, bereaueth it of all length and breadth, and by consequent maketh it to be no more a body.

4 In the Eucharist they make the body of our Lord to be more spirituall then the soules. For a soule is but in one place, & is neuer separated from it selfe, as they say the Lords body is, which is whole in heauen, and whole in an hundred thousand places here on earth all at one time, and is not in the region betweene both.

5 Also euery humane body hath his interior parts situated in their naturall places, as the heart inclosed in the heart-case, the braine that filleth the membranes and the inner hollowneſſe of the head. If that be not in Iesus Christ, he is no man. Then seeing it is manifest that the interior parts of the body of Iesus Christ occupie a space, and are circumscribed by the place, which is the interior superficies of the body which containeth them, is it not a contradiction vnto themselues, to beleeue that the seuerall parts of the body of Christ do fill a space, and are contained in a place, but that all the body doth not fill any space, nor is contained in any place? As if one should say, that euery seuerall part of a body is white, and that the whole body is blacke.

6 Againe, by transsubstantiation they make and produce a body which was a body before they make it. For the body of Iesus Christ which is already in heauen, is made by the Priest here on earth: as if while *M. Arnoux* is at Paris, he should be begotten in Rome.

7 We haue shewed before, that this doctrine giues Iesus Christ two contrary bodies at one time: one body sitting at the table, the other in the mouthes of the Apostles which sate not at the table: one body speaking and mouing, the other

not

not ſpeaking, nor able to ſtirre it ſelfe. One a weake & paſſible body, the other without infirmitie and impaſſible. One body which ſuffered and ſwet drops of bloud, the other in the ſtomackes of the Apoſtles, which ſuffered no paine: which of theſe is our Redeemer?

8 And when they ſay that the conſecrated hoſt is round, what meane they by the hoſt? Do they vnderſtand Ieſus Chriſt? Ieſus Chriſt is not round. Or do they vnderſtand the accidents? Thoſe accidents are not the hoſt. In this matter they can hardly ſpeake three words without contradicting themſelues.

9 It ſerues not their turnes to giue the body of Chriſt two beings, the one naturall, the other ſacramentall. For, beſides that one thing can haue but one being, and that to giue Ieſus Chriſt a ſacramentall being, that is to ſay, ſignificatiue, is to build caſtles in the aire; our aduerſaries confeſſe, that vnder the *ſpecies* Ieſus Chriſt hath alſo his naturall being: whereby it followeth, that alſo in that naturall being which is vnder the *ſpecies*, theſe things muſt happen vnto it, to be in no place, to haue no ſpace, to haue his length vnder a point, and ſuch like things diſagreeing with a true body.

10 The worſt is, that by ſcattering the body of our Lord in many places at once, the Church of Rome maketh the Hiſtory of the Goſpell not onely doubtfull, but alſo ridiculous. For if the body of Ieſus Chriſt can be in diuers places at once, and diſtant one farre from another, and neuertheleſſe ſtill remaine an humane body, who can aſſure me that then when Ieſus Chriſt was vpon the croſſe, he was not walking in another place? and that when he was before *Pilate* in Ieruſalem, he was not aſleepe in Alexandria? and that when he was in the bleſſed virgin *Maries* wombe, he was not in other womens wombs? And why Ieſus Chriſt went ſo often from Galilee to Ieruſalem, ſeeing that without ſtirring from Galilee, he might be in Ieruſalem? and when *Ioſeph* and *Marie* had left him in Ieruſalem againſt their wils, why turned they backe againe to fetch him, ſeeing that he could ſtay in Ieruſalem, and yet haue followed them in the way?

11. For it is an abuſe to ſay vnto vs, that as then the body of Chriſt was not yet glorified: ſeeing that in the inſtitution of this Sacrament he was yet weake and not glorified, and yet they ſay, that then his body was whole vnder euery part of the hoſt, and in euery one of his diſciples mouthes.

12 If for an anſwer thereunto they aske vs, and ſay, Is not God powerfull enough to do it? I will likewiſe anſwer thē, and ſay, That God is no leſſe powerfull to do otherwiſe, & that he is wiſe to do no ſuch thing. All that which is written in the Alcoran, may be proued in the ſame manner, by ſaying that God is able to do ſo. The will, and not the power of God is the rule of our beliefe. It is a great wrong to binde the omnipotent power of God to do all that which we imagine or conceiue, and to binde it with ridiculous bands, vnder pretence of exalting him, to make him captiue tō vs. God is omnipotent, becauſe he doth all whatſoeuer he will, and not all that we will preſcribe vnto him. But we haue ſeene before, that the will of God is cleane contrary vnto that which our aduerſaries will haue him to will.

13 And though we ought onely to endeuour to exalt the omnipotencie of God, without making inquirie of his will, yet it ſhall appeare that we exalt the power of God and of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, and that our aduerſaries diminiſh and derogate from it.

For, it is much more agreeable to the power of Ieſus Chriſt, to communicate himſelfe vnto vs without comming downe here vpon earth: as the Sunne is much more admirable, by making it ſelfe preſent with vs from ſo farre off, and making vs feele his vertue, then if his body ſhould approch neerer to the earth.

14 Adde hereunto, that vnder the hoſt Ieſus Chriſt is not onely put into the power of a man, but alſo made ſo vnable, that our aduerſaries acknowledge, that vnder the *ſpecies* he can neither breathe, moue, nor open his eyes: for how ſhould he there change place, ſeeing he hath no place? How ſhould he go vnder the *ſpecies*, ſeeing they put him whole vnder one indiuiſible point which hath no length? For all

all mouing requires ſome extenſion.

15 Is this an exalting of the Maieſtie and greatneſſe of the eternall Sonne of God, to make him ſubiect to the will of a Prieſt, which many times is not an honeſt man, who maketh Ieſus Chriſt when he will, carrieth him whither he will, and keepes him vnder locke and key? and to make cautions and prouiſions againſt all inconueniences that may happen, if the bloud ſhall chãce to be ſpilt, or to freeze, or if rats gnaw or eate the body of Ieſus Chriſt, or if the Prieſt by weakeneſſe or drunkenneſſe caſteth vp the hoſt out of his ſtomacke? Is this an honoring of God, and of his eternall Sonne, to call God an hoſt that may be ſtolne away? that may receiue cuts with a kinſe, like the Ieſus Chriſt of Billettes in Paris? that may be carried away by beaſts? that may fall into the dirt, & being fallen, cannot riſe againe? For although they ſay that Ieſus Chriſt ſuffereth nothing by all that, becauſe he is impaſſible, yet thereby he is greatly diſhonored, and the Sonne of God is openly derided, and expoſed to the laughter of the enemies of the Goſpell.

16 It is alſo a diſhonour to Ieſus Chriſt, to make men beleeue that the bones and relikes of Saints, dead at the leaſt 12. or 15. hundred yeeres before, can remaine without rotting, and yet by experience to acknowledge, that the hoſt becõmeth mouldy in a few dayes, and that the preſence of Ieſus Chriſt, which is in it (as they ſay) doth not preſerue it from vermine and the teeth of beaſts.

17 But Ieſus Chriſt is ſpecially diſhonoured hereby, that in the Papall proceſſion the hoſt is carried vpon a curtall with a lanterne, but the Pope is borne vpon the ſhoulders of Kings and Princes, or vpon the ſhoulders of their ambaſſadors. And that in the Papall Maſſe the Pope is ten times more honored, and there is ten times more reuerence and religious honor done vnto him then to God, which (as they ſay) he holdeth in his hands.

This proceſſion is ſet out in the firſt Booke of Ceremonies, lib. 1. ſect. 2.

18 The ancient Fathers ſpake of the body of our Lord with more reſpect; for they were ſo farre off from beleeuing that it could be eaten by rats, that on the contrarie they beleeued

ued that prophane persons eate it not, although they receiue the Sacrament. * Saint *Augustine* in his booke of Sentences collected by *Prosper*, saith, *He that disagreeth with Iesus Christ, eateth not the flesh of Christ, nor drinketh his blood, although he receiueth the Sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation.* And in the 56. Treatise vpon Saint *Iohn*, he saith, that the disciples did eate the bread which is the Lord, but that *Iudas* did eate the bread of the Lord, against the Lord. For this Doctor beleeued that Iesus Christ is not eaten but by faith.

* *Qui discordat à Christo, nec carnem Christi manducat, nec sanguinem bibit, etsi tanta rei Sacramentum ad iudicium sui quotidie accipit. Illi manducabant panem Dominum, ille panem Domini contra Dominum.*

That in the sixt chapter of Saint Iohn there is nothing that maketh for Transsubstantiation, and that there is not any thing at all spoken of eating the flesh of Iesus Christ with the mouth.

31. *Sect.* The Capernaitan Iewes followed Iesus Christ into the desart, not to heare his words, but to be fed with bread: but Iesus Christ making their gluttony a meanes to instruct them, from thence tooke occasion to speake vnto them of another kind of food, and of a celestiall bread, whereof whosoeuer eateth, liueth eternally, and that bread is himselfe. And it is to be noted, that then the holy Supper was not instituted, nor in two yeeres after.

The difference betweene vs and our aduersaries consisteth in this eating. We say, that in this Chapter he speaketh onely of a spirituall eating which is done by faith: in the same manner as in the fourth Chapter Iesus Christ speaketh to the Samaritane woman, of a water whereof whosoeuer shall drink, shall neuer thirst: where he speaketh not of a material water, but of a spirituall grace. But our aduersaries say, that in this Chapter he speaketh of two sorts of eating, the one spirituall by faith, which is continued from the 32. to the 50. verse: the other corporall, which is done by the mouth of the body, by the which Iesus Christ is really eaten with the mouth in the Eucha-

Euchariſt, whereof they ſay Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh in the reſt of the Chapter.

But if we examine the whole tenour of Chriſts ſpeech, we ſhall not find any one clauſe therein, which is not contrary to this eating of Ieſus Chriſt with the mouth.

1 In the 32 and 50. verſes he ſaith, that he is the bread that came downe from heauen, ſhewing, that that bread is not onely the fleſh of Ieſus Chriſt, (for that deſcended not from heauen) but alſo his Diuinitie. Then if that bread which deſcended from heauen, ſhould be eaten with the mouth, we muſt alſo eate the Diuinitie.

2 In the 35. verſe he ſaith, *I am the bread of life*: words which ſerue for the vnderſtanding of theſe words, *This is my bodie*. For if by theſe words, *This is my body*, we muſt vnderſtand, *This is tranſſubſtantiated into my body*, we muſt alſo by theſe words, *I am the bread*, vnderſtand that Ieſus Chriſt is tranſſubſtantiated into bread.

3 Ieſus Chriſt addeth, *He that beleeueth in me, ſhall neuer thirſt*. Where plainly he putteth, *to beleeue*, in ſtead of, *to drinke*; ſeeing he ſaith, that by beleeuing, our thirſt ſhall be quenched. The coherence of his diſcourſe, and the naturall conſequence, requireth that he ſhould haue ſaid, *He that drinketh, ſhall neuer thirſt*: but he ſaid, *He that beleeueth*, in ſtead of, *He that drinketh*; to teach vs that he ſpeaketh of a drinke which is taken by faith. *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth the ſame, and confeſſeth that in that place there is nothing ſpoken of the Sacrament, but of faith in the incarnation.

4 The 47. verſe is no leſſe plaine, where the Lord ſaith, *He that beleeueth in me, hath life eternall: I am the bread of life*. He ſheweth, that this bread is taken by faith. For ſeeing that he which beleeueth in him, hath life euerlaſting, from thence he inferreth, that he is the bread of life.

5 In the 50. verſe he addeth, *If any man eateth of this bread, he ſhall not die*: and in the 54 verſe, *He that eateth my fleſh, hath life euerlaſting*. Then wicked perſons eate not the fleſh of our Lord, becauſe they haue not life eternall. For it is certaine, that Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh not of eating with the mouth, nor

of the Eucharist: for many eate thereof which haue not life eternall; as *Iudas*, and an infinite number of hypocrites.

Our aduersaries to excuse themselues herein, adde a piece which is fetcht out of their owne braines, and not to be found in the Word of God: for they say, that Iesus Christ vnderstood, that he that eateth his flesh worthily, hath life eternall. But this word *worthily* is vnworthily added by them, and cleane contrary to the truth, seeing that thereby they suppose that a man may eate the flesh of our Lord vnworthily. For seeing that to eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, is to trust in his death, as we haue proued, and our aduersaries do confesse, it is manifest, that no man can vnworthily beleeue in Iesus Christ, seeing that all our worthinesse consisteth in beleeuing in Iesus Christ. Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 11. speaketh of eating the bread vnworthily, but not of eating the Lords body vnworthily. A man may take the signe, but not the truth vnworthily. Therefore, as to excuse themselues touching the place in Saint *Iohn*, their adde their owne imagination to the word of God; so to defend themselues against this place of Saint *Paul*, they make a figure thereof. And this word *worthily* being by them added, yet that place is still contrary to the Church of Rome, which beleeueth that many which haue taken the host worthily, are neuertheless damned.

6 The 53. verse is of no lesse force, where Iesus Christ saith, *Except ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood, ye haue no life in you.* There it is plaine, that he speaketh not of eating the Sacrament with the mouth: for he speaketh of an eating necessary to saluation, without the which a man cannot haue eternall life. Now many attaine to eternall life, which neuer participated in that Sacrament, as Saint *Iohn Baptist*, the theeue crucified with Iesus Christ, and many faithfull persons that died before they were partakers of the same. If we do not eate the flesh of the Lord but in the Sacrament, what shall become of so many faithfull persons which did not participate in the same? Then here againe they adde another piece vnto the Word of God: for they say, that Iesus Christ would haue said, *If you eate not the flesh of the Sonne*

of

of man while you haue meanes to do it, you ſhall not haue life eternall. There is no ſentence in the Scripture ſo expreſſe, which may not be peruerted by thruſting in of words, and adding ſomewhat of our owne thereunto. And yet this being added, this place condemneth the Church of Rome, which beleeueth not, that all thoſe that receiue not the hoſt at Eaſter, when they haue meanes to do it, are therefore damned. The Church of Rome neuer giueth the conſecrated hoſt to men that are condemned to die, yet our aduerſaries do not beleeue that they are damned.

7 In the 56. verſe the Lord addeth, *He that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my bloud, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* This, concerneth not eating with the mouth, either in regard of hypocrites, or in regard of the faithfull. For if an hypocrite hath receiued the Sacrament, that makes him not to dwell in Ieſus Chriſt: and if a faithfull perſon hath receiued it, the Church of Rome doth not beleeue that Ieſus Chriſt dwelleth in him: for ſhe ſaith, that as ſoone as the *ſpecies* are digeſted in the ſtomake, the body of Ieſus Chriſt is no more there.

8 Laſtly, Ieſus Chriſt, to aduertiſe his diſciples that his words ought not to be taken in a carnall and groſſe ſence, but to ſhew them that they are quickening & ſpirituall, ſaith vnto them, *Theſe words are ſpirit and life.* But they giue not life, if they be not taken ſpiritually.

You muſt alſo note, that in all this diſcourſe, wherein he promiſeth to giue his fleſh to be eaten, he ſpake to the Capernaitan Iewes, to whom he neuer adminiſtred the Euchariſt, and which continued obſtinately in their Iewiſh opinions. It is certaine that Ieſus Chriſt is no lyer: if he had promiſed to adminiſter the Sacramẽt to the Capernaitans, he would haue kept his promiſe: and the vnworthineſſe of the Capernaitans could not haue kept the Lord from offering the Sacrament vnto them according to his promiſe, which neuertheleſſe he did not. By this meanes our aduerſaries, as much as in them lyeth, make Ieſus Chriſt a lyer.

10 We muſt likewiſe remember, that the Euchariſt was not as then inſtituted, nor till two yeeres after; and yet at that time

time Ieſus Chriſt was the true bread of life. For in the 35. verſe he ſaith, *I am the bread of life*: and in the 50. verſe, *This is the bread, &c.* And in the 54. verſe, *He that eateth my fleſh, &c.* From that time therefore this bread was eaten by the faithfull, although the Euchariſt was not then inſtituted.

We muſt not thinke it ſtrange, if ſometimes he ſpeaketh in the future tenſe, ſaying, *This bread which I will giue, &c.* for he had a reſpect to his death, wherein he was to giue himſelfe for the life of the world.

We muſt not likewiſe wonder when the Lord ſaith, that his fleſh is meate indeed: for this word *indeed*, doth not hinder but that the word fleſh may be taken figuratiuely, no more then whē Ieſus Chriſt in the 15. 1. of S. Ioh. ſaith, *I am the true vine*; where the word *true* excludeth not the figure. Figuratiue words ceaſſe not to be true. Adde moreouer that the fleſh of Ieſus Chriſt crucified, is the true food of our ſoules. The ſoule hath two principall faculties, the vnderſtanding, & the will: the vnderſtanding is nouriſhed by inſtructiō, the will by conſolatiō. The fleſh of Ieſus Chriſt crucified furniſheth theſe two nouriſhments. For by the death of Ieſus Chriſt we are certified and inſtructed of and in the meanes, that God hath ordained to reconcile himſelfe vnto vs; and that onely is our ſoueraigne conſolation: for without it our ſoules languiſh and wither in deſpaire, like a member fallen into a conſumption, or like a body deſtitute of nouriſhment.

We muſt not thinke it ſtrange that our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt vſed this allegory, ſeeing that not long before he vſed the like allegory, ſpeaking to the Samaritan woman of a water, whereof whoſoeuer ſhall drinke, ſhall neuer thirſt. And that it is an ordinary thing in the Scripture to call the word of God and his graces, ſometimes bread, ſometimes milke, and ſometimes ſtrong meate. Beſides that, Ieſus Chriſt had particular reaſons to moue him to ſpeake in that manner to the Capernaitans, that had as it were forcibly conſtrained him to vſe that allegory, importunately asking him if he could do as *Moſes* did, that gaue them bread from heauen. As alſo that they were incredulous, to whom he vſed to ſpeake by figures

John 4.

and

and parables, as Saint *Matthew* 13.34. ſaith, *And without a parable ſpake he not vnto them.*

Our aduerſaries themſelues acknowledge, that to the 50. verſe Ieſus Chriſt did not ſpeake of eating of the Sacrament which is done with the mouth, but of that which is done by faith: but in the verſes following they ſay that he ſpeaketh of eating with the mouth. And yet in all that chapter there is nothing ſaid of two kinds of eating, nor any thing that ſhould moue vs ſo to vnderſtand that ſpeech of Ieſus Chriſt.

And I wonder how they dare in ſuch manner contradict [a] Pope *Innocent* the third, who in the fourteenth chapter and fourth booke of the Myſteries of the Maſſe, declareth, that in thoſe verſes which our aduerſaries alledge for eating with the mouth, Chriſt ſpeaketh of ſpirituall eating by faith, and ſaith, *The Lord ſpeaketh of ſpirituall eating, ſaying, If you eate not the fleſh of the Sonne of man, and drinke not his bloud, you ſhall not haue eternall life in you. In this manner thoſe onely that are good, eate the body of our Lord. And therefore he ſaith, He that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my bloud, dwelleth in me, and I in him. For he that dwelleth in charitie, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Why doſt thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly? Beleeue, and thou haſt eaten.*

With the like obſtinacie they oppoſe themſelues againſt Pope *Gelaſius*, who in his booke againſt *Eutyches*, and againſt *Neſtorius*, ſpeaketh thus of the holy Sacrament, [b] *Certainly the Sacraments of the body and bloud of our Lord which we receiue, are a diuine thing, and ſo by them we are made partakers of the diuine nature. And yet the ſubſtance or nature of bread and wine ſtill remaine. And certainly the image and reſemblance of the body and of the bloud of Chriſt is celebrated in this myſterie.* But our aduerſaries had rather diſagree with their Popes, then to agree with vs. But if that booke was not made by Pope *Gelaſius*, as the title importeth, but by *Gelaſius*, Biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtina, as *Bellarmine* ſuſpecteth, the booke ſhall be the more ancient and of greater authority. Neuertheleſſe, *Photius* ſpeaking of *Gelaſius* workes, maketh mention of a booke entituled, κατ' ἀνομοίων, which were.

[a] *De ſpirituali comeſtione Dominus ait: Niſi manducaueritis carnem Filij hominis, & biberitis eius ſanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Hoc modo corpus Chriſti ſoli boni comedunt, &c.*

[b] *Certè ſacramenta quæ ſumimus corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, diuina res eſt, propter quod & per eadem diuinæ effigiemur conſortes naturæ, & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certe imago & ſimilitudo corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti in actione myſteriorum celebrantur.*

were of the ſect of *Actius*, but ſpeaketh nothing of the booke againſt *Eutyches* and *Neſtorius*.

The Decretall of the Romiſh Church, in the ſecond Diſtinction of Conſecration, is full of expreſſe ſentences to that purpoſe. In the Canon [a] *Prima quidem*, *Vnderſtand that which I ſay ſpiritually. You ſhall not eate that body which you ſee, nor drinke the bloud which thoſe that ſhall crucifie me, will ſhed. I haue recommended a ſacred ſigne vnto you, which being vnderſtood ſpiritually, will quicken you.*

[a] *Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus ſum, non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi eſtis, & bibituri illum ſanguinem quem effuſuri ſunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendaui: ſpiritualiter intellectum viuificabit vos.*

And in the Canon *Vt quid*: [b] *Why doeſt thou prepare thy teeth and thy bellie? Beleeue and thou haſt eaten: for to beleeue in him, is to eate the bread and the wine; he that beleeueth in him, eateth him.*

[b] *Vt quid paras dentem & ventrem? crede & manducaſti. Credere enim in eum, hoc eſt panem & vinum manducare. Qui credit in eum, manducat eum.*

Which contrarieth not thoſe that by eating vnderſtand ſomething more then to beleeue, and therein alſo comprehend the effect of faith, which is to be nouriſhed and quickened: which comes all to one, for of neceſſitie the one followeth the other.

We conclude therefore, that in this chapter Ieſus Chriſt ſpeaketh not of eating his body with the mouth, neither vnderſtandeth that he muſt go downe into our ſtomackes. For the nouriſhment of the ſoule is not receiued by the mouth of the body. To feed the body by hearing, and to feede the ſoule by the mouth, are two like abſurdities. It is not more abſurd to fecde the ſtomacke with ſongs, then to cauſe the nouriſhment of the ſoule to paſſe through our teeth and our throats. Ieſus Chriſt cannot be eaten by his enemies, much leſſe by beaſts. He is the bread of children and not of ſtrangers. This bread is giuen to the liuing, and not to the dead: to dwell in vs, and not to paſſe through vs. It is a meate neceſſary for ſaluation, and not as the Sacrament of his body, without the which many are ſaued, and which turnes to many mens condemnation. It is a remedy againſt all our ſinnes, and not onely againſt veniall ſinnes and thoſe whereof mens conſciences are aready diſcharged, as the Church of Rome teacheth; making the Euchariſt to be a plaiſter for a wound that is healed, and a meane to diſcharge mens conſciences of ſinnes, whereof

Bellar. lib. 4. de Euchar. cap. 17. & 38.

whereof they are already discharged. Whereby they make the Eucharist to be a thousand times of lesse efficacie then Baptisme, wherein there is no transsubstantiation made. For they say, that Baptisme is simply necessary for saluation, and that by Baptisme all precedent sinnes, as well mortall as veniall, are blotted out, both for the guilt and for the punishment.

That the Masse, and the Decretals and Glosses of the Church of Rome, ouerthrow Transsubstantiation.

Although the marke of Papall religion is to go to Masse, yet the Masse is much contrary to the Papacie. For the Canon of the Masse is composed of diuers pieces set together, whereof the greatest part are ancient prayers, which ouerthrow Merits, Purgatorie, and Transsubstantiation. 32 *Sect.*

You must vnderstand, that in the Primitiue Church the sacred table stood in the middle of the Church, whereupon the people came to offer gifts and presents of bread and wine, and of fruits, which presents were called oblations and sacrifices. Of that bread and wine brought in great quantity and set vpon the table, the Minister tooke one part for the celebration of the holy Sacrament, as much as needed to communicate the same vnder both kinds vnto the faithfull; the rest was for the poore. Before the administration of the Sacrament to the people, they made all the Catechumeni, Penitents, and such as were possessed, and all those that either would not, or could not receiue the communion, to go out of the Church.

Ouer these presents and gifts of the people, appointed for the celebration of the holy Supper, diuers prayers were said, whereof the greatest part are at this day said in the Masse, but changed into another sence. For as in stead of a quantitie of bread to communicate to all the assembly, at this day they haue but a little round wafer which they call God: so whereas those prayers were said ouer the bread & the wine, now the same

same prayers are said ouer the consecrated host, which they say is Iesus Christ. Whereby it happeneth, that in those prayers the Priest speaketh against his owne intent, and plainly contradicteth his Churches beliefe, and pronounceth words that are injurious to Iesus Christ.

a Panem sanctum vitæ æternæ, & calicem salutis perpetuæ. Supra quæ propitio ac serono vultu respicere dignaris, & accepta habere, vt accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel.

For after the words of a Consecration, offering Iesus Christ to God, he speaketh in this manner to God, saying, *Vpon which things may it please thee to looke with a good and fauourable countenance, and to accept of them, as thou diddest accept of the presents of Abel thy righteous child.* This prayer might be said vpon the offerings and almes of the people, but in no sort vpon Iesus Christ. For is there any likelihood that Iesus Christ should be called *These things*, as if they spake of diuers Iesus Christs, and of things without life? Againe, can he without impietie desire God to accept as well of Iesus Christ, as he accepted of the beast sacrificed by *Abel*? Their ordinary excuse in this is, that the Priest doth not desire God to accept as well of Iesus Christ, as he did accept of the lambe offered by *Abel*, but that God would be pleased to accept as well of our deuotion as of that of *Abels*: But the words of the Masse will not beare this exposition, which compare not *Abels* deuotion with ours, but the presents which the Priest offereth to God, with those that *Abel* offered, saying, Accept as well of these sacrifices and of these presents, as thou diddest accept of *Abels* presents. The host and the present is not the deuotion. There is great difference betweene a present, and the will, which oftentimes is accepted without a present.

b Supplices te rogamus omnipotens Deus, iube hæc perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum.

The Priest addeth, b *We beseech thee, most puissant God, to command that these things may be borne by the hands of thy holy Angell into thy heauenly Palace, into the presence of thy diuine Maiestie.* Is there any thing in all this that can be applyed to Iesus Christ? Is Iesus Christ presented by the Angels to his Father? Hath he any need of the helpe of Angels to be presented to God?

c Memento etiam Domine famulorum famularumque tuarum qui nos præcesserunt cum signo fidei, & dormiunt in somno pacis.

There followeth a prayer for the dead, c saying, *Lord, remember thy seruants which haue gone before vs with the signe of faith,*

faith, and that ſleepe in peace. For then they beleeued not that mens ſoules were burnt in a fire.

After this there followeth a long catalogue of the names of many Saints; which rehearſed, they make this prayer to God, ſaying, *In whoſe company we beſeech thee to receiue vs, not regarding our merits, but pardoning our offences.* This is contrarie to merits.

Intra quorum nos conſortium non æſtimator meriti, ſed veniæ largitor admittas, per Chriſtum Dominum noſtrũ, per quem Domine hæc omnia ſemper bona creas, ſanctificas, viuificas, benedicis.

But the words that immediatly follow, are ſpecially to be conſidered, where it is ſaid, *By Chriſt our Lord, by whom, oh Lord, thou alwayes createſt for vs all theſe good things, thou ſanctifieſt, quickeneſt, and bleſſeſt them.* Is there any thing in all this that agreeth to Ieſus Chriſt? For can they call the conſecrated bread which they call the hoſt, *all theſe good things*, if that hoſt be Ieſus Chriſt? Doth God alwayes quicken Ieſus Chriſt? Doth God create and quicken Ieſus Chriſt by Ieſus Chriſt? Theſe ſpeeches are fit being applied to the bread and wine, but not vnto Ieſus Chriſt. If by theſe words they vnderſtand that he ſpeaketh of the bread and wine, conſidering them as they were before conſecration, thereby they fall into three ineuitable abſurdities. The one is, that they giue thankes vnto God, becauſe he created the bread and the wine in the Euchariſt, when that bread and wine is no more bread & wine. The ſecond is, that he ſheweth the bread and the wine, as being preſent, ſaying, *Hæc omnia bona, All theſe good things*, when thoſe things are no more thoſe good things; vſing a demonſtratiue pronowne of a thing preſent, to ſhew nothing. The third abſurditie is, that thoſe words are ſpoken then when the Prieſt is about to lift vp the hoſt to cauſe it to be adored. Is not this a thing againſt all reaſon & apparence, that then when men adore the hoſt, and pretend to ſacrifice the eternall Sonne of God to God, the Prieſt giueth thankes to God, becauſe he cauſeth the bread and wine to grow? and remembreth not to giue him thankes, becauſe he hath put Ieſus Chriſt into his hands to ſacrifice and to eate him? As if then when they are to render vp their ſoules vnto God, they ſhould giue thankes vnto God, becauſe he maketh it raine vpon the vines, without giuing him thanks for redeeming

ming our ſoules from hell, by the death of Ieſus Chriſt.

The many ſignes of the Croſſe [a] which the Prieſt maketh vpon the hoſt and vpon the cup, witneſſe that the beliefe of the Church of Rome hath bene changed. For Pope *Innocent* the third, in his ſecond booke of the Myſteries of the Maſſe, 58. cha. ſaith, that the Prieſt makes ſignes of the Croſſe vpon theſe things, to driue away the diuell, leſt he ſhould preuaile againſt the Prieſt, or againſt the ſacrifice, that is, againſt Ieſus Chriſt. But it is not credible that thoſe who brought in that cuſtome, would be ſo ridiculouſly officious, as to take vpon them by ſignes of the Croſſe made in the aire, to defend Ieſus Chriſt againſt the diuell.

[a] *Efficit ſuper ea crucis ſignaculum, vt per crucis virtutem omnes conatus diabolicæ malignitatis effugiant, ne contra ſacerdotem vel ſacrificium aliquo modo prauleat.*

The Gloſſe of the Romiſh Decretall vpon the Canon, *Hoc eſt*, in the 2. Diſtinction of Conſecration, is no leſſe expreſſe touching this ſubiect, then if it had bene made at Geneua: [b] *The celeſtiall Sacrament which truly repreſenteth the fleſh of Chriſt, is called the body of Chriſt, but improperly: And therefore it is called ſo after a ſort, but not in the truth of the thing, but by a ſignificant myſterie: So that this is the true ſence, it is called the body of Chriſt, that is, it is ſignified thereby.* Theſe words are very conſiderable.

[b] *Cæleſte Sacramentum quod verè repræſentat Chriſti carnem, dicitur corpus Chriſti, ſed improprie, vnde dicitur ſuo modo, ſed non rei veritate, ſed ſignificante myſterio, vt ſit ſenſus, vocatur corpus Chriſti, i. ſignificatur.*

In the ſame Diſtinction it is ſaid, [c] *He that diſagreeth with Ieſus Chriſt, eateth not his fleſh, nor drinketh his bloud, although euery day he receiueth the Sacrament of ſo great a thing to his condemnation.*

[c] *Can. Qui diſcordat à Chriſto non manducat carnem eius, nec bibit ſanguinem, etſi tantæ rei ſacramentum ad iudicii ſui perditionis quotidie accipit.*

The like in the Canon *De hac*. [d] *It is permitted to eate of this hoſt, which is wonderfully made in remembrance of Ieſus Chriſt. But no man is permitted in the ſame to eate of that which Ieſus Chriſt offered vpon the altar of the Croſſe.*

And in the Canon *Quia morte*, (likewiſe taken out of Saint *Auguſtine*) it is ſaid, [e] *Becauſe we are deliuered by the death of our Lord, in remembrance thereof, when we eate and drinke, we ſignifie his fleſh and his bloud, which were offered for vs.*

[d] *De hac quidem hoſtia quæ in Chriſti commemoratione mirabiliter fit edere licet. De illa verò quam Chriſtus in ara crucis obtulit, ſecundum ſe nulli edere licet.*

[e] *Quia morte Domini liberati ſumus, huius rei memoriam in edendo & potando, carnem & ſanguinem quæ pro nobis oblata ſunt, ſignificamus.*

The

The Maſſe (as we haue ſeene) hath diuers formall prayers againſt Tranſubſtantiation: yet there is a manifeſt fraud vſed, and a changing of the ancient Liturgie. The Prieſt ſaith: * *Which oblation, may it pleaſe thee, oh God, in all things to make it, bleſſe it, regiſter it, ratifie it, and accept it, that vnto vs it may bee made the body and the blond of thy moſt deare Sonne.*

* *Quam oblationem tu Deus, in omnibus queſumus benedictam, aſcriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris, vt nobis corpus & ſanguis fiat dilectiſſimi filij tui Domini noſtri Ieſu Chriſti, Qui pridie, &c.*

But we haue the ſame prayer in the 5. Chap. of the 4. booke of Sacraments, among Saint *Ambroſe* works, in theſe words: ** *Make this oblation for vs to be eſteemed as reaſonable, and acceptable, which is the figure of the body and of the blond of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt.*

** *Fac nobis hanc oblationem aſcriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod eſt figura corporis & ſanguinis Domini noſtri Ieſu Chriſti. Qui pridie, &c.*

An horrible deprauation; for whereas the ancient Fathers ſaid, *that this oblation is the figure of the body of Chriſt*, they ſay, *That this oblation may be made vnto vs the body of Chriſt.* This deſerues ſeriouſly to be thought vpon.

Certaine places out of the ancient Fathers touching this ſubiect.

Tertullian in his third booke againſt *Marcion*, the 19. Chap. [a] ſaith, *God hath ſo reuealed it in your Goſpell, calling the bread his body, that thereby thou mighteſt vnderſtand, that he hath made the bread to be the figure of his body.*

[a] *Panem ſuum corpus appellans, vt & hinc iam tum intelligat corporis ſui figuram panem dediſſe.*

Alſo in his fourth booke againſt *Marcion*, 40. chapter, diſputing againſt the Marcionites which denied that Ieſus Chriſt had a true body, [b] he ſaith, *Ieſus Chriſt hauing taken bread and giuen it to his Diſciples, made it to be his body, ſaying, This is my body, that is to ſay, the figure of my body: now this ſhould not be a figure, if he had not had a true body.* His reaſon is, becauſe we cannot truly prefigurate thoſe things that are not.

[b] *Acceptum panem & diſtributum diſcipulis, corpus ſuum fecit, dicendo, Hoc eſt corpus meum: id eſt, figura corporis mei.*

Cyprian in the third Epiſtle of his ſecond booke ſaith, [c] *We find that the cup which the Lord offered was mixed, and that that which he called his blond, was wine.*

[c] *Vinum fuit quod ſanguinem ſuum dixit.*

Origen vpon the 15. of Saint Matthew ſaith ** This meate which is ſanctified by the Word of God and by Prayer, as touching the materiall ſubſtance deſcendeth into the bellie, and is caſt into the draught, and of his owne nature doth not ſanctifie. There alſo he calleth that which we receiue in the Euchariſt, a ſymbolicall or figuratiue body.

Euſebius in the eighth booke of Euangelicall Demonſtration, cap. 1. ſaith, * We haue receiued this cuſtome, to celebrate the memory of this Sacrifice vpon the table, by the wholeſome ſignes of his body and of his bloud, according to the lawes of the new couenant.

Saint Auguſtine againſt Adimantus, Chap. 12. ſaith: ** The Lord made no difficulty to ſay, This is my body, when he gaue the ſigne of his body. There he doth not onely ſay, that the Lord gaue the ſigne of his body, but alſo expoundeth theſe words; This is my body, by the ſigne of my body.

Vpon the third Pſalme he ſaith: Ieſus Chriſt receiued Iudas to the feaſt, at the which he recommended and gaue the ſigne of his bodie and of his bloud to his diſciples.

In the 45. Treatiſe vpon Saint Iohn, This rocke was Chriſt. He ſaith, Behold then, that faith remaining, the ſignes are diuers. Then the rocke was Chriſt, and now that which is ſet vpon the table, is Chriſt. Will you learne of Saint Auguſtine how that which is ſet vpon the table is Chriſt? It is as in time paſt the Rocke was Chriſt.

Vpon the 98. Pſalme he ſaith, Vnderſtand that which I haue ſaid vnto you ſpiritually; you ſhall not eate that which you ſee, nor drinke the bloud which thoſe that ſhall crucifie me will ſhed: I haue recommended a ſacred ſigne vnto you, which being vnderſtood ſpiritually, will quicken you.

And in the 50. Treatiſe vpon Saint Iohn: * Shall I take Ieſus that is abſent? How ſhall I ſtretch out my hand to heauen where he

* Τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως, κατὰ μὲν τὴν προσβολὴν τῆς ὕλης εἰς τὸν ὑποδοχέα τόπον ἐκβάλλεται, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθ' ἑαυτὸ δὲ οὐκ ἁγιάζει.

* Τοῦτο τὸ τῆς θυσίας τύπον μνήμην ποιούμενοι, τὴν σωτήριον τράπεζαν ἐπιτελοῦμεν διὰ συμβόλων, τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος καὶ δεσμοῦ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης

** Non dubitauit dicere hoc eſt corpus meum, cum daret ſignum corporis ſui. Iudam admiſit ad conuiuium in quo corporis & ſanguinis ſui figuram ſuis commendauit & tradidit. Videte ſide manentes ſigna variantur. Ibi petra Chriſtus, nobis Chriſtus quod in altari ponitur. Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus ſum. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi eſtis & bibituri illum ſanguinem quem fuſuri ſunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendaui, ſpiritualiter intellectum viuificabit vos. * Quem tenebo abſentem? Quomodo in cælum manum mittam, vt ibi ſedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, & tenuiſti. Parentes tenuerunt carne, tu tene corde.

is set, to lay hold on him? To this that holy personage answereth and saith: *Send thy faith thither, and thou hast laid hold vpon him: thy ancestors* (the Iewes) *had him bodily among them, hold thou him in thy heart.* And in the first Treatise vpon the first Epistle of Saint *Iohn*, he saith, *Ipsum iam in cœlo sedentem manu contrectare non possumus, sed fide contingere: Being set in heauen, we cannot handle him any more with our hands, but we may touch him with our hearts.*

In the 23. Epistle to *Boniface*, he saith, [a] *The Sacrament of the bodie of Christ, is some manner is the body of Christ, and the Sacrament of the blood of Christ, is the blood of Christ.* And to shew how the Sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, he saith for example, it is as Baptisme which is the Sacrament of faith is faith, and as we are said to be buried by Baptisme.

And in the sixteenth Chapter of the third booke of Christian Doctrine, [b] *If* (saith Iesus Christ) *you eate not the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke not his blood, you shall not haue life in you. It seemeth that he commandeth a wicked thing. Therefore it is a figure, commanding vs to communicate in the passion of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to haue in remembrance, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for vs.* Note, that he doth not onely say, that there is a figure in these words, *If you eate not the flesh of the Sonne of man*, but also that he expoundeth this figure, thus, that in the sixt Chapter of Saint *Iohn*, to eate the flesh of the Lord, is to haue his death and passion in remembrance; which is an exposition which the Church of Rome receiueth not.

Ephraim Patriarch of Antiochia, alledged by *Photius* in his Library, saith, [c] *The body of Christ which the faithfull receiue, loseth not his sensible substance; and is not separated from the intelligible grace. Also Baptisme being wholly spirituall and single, keepeth the propertie of his sensible substance, that is to say, of water, and loseth not that which it was before.* This is an

[a] Sicut ergo secundùm quandàm modum Sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, Sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est: ita Sacramentum fidei fides est.

[b] Nisi manducaueritis carnem filij hominis & non bibueritis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel flagitium videtur iubere. Figura est ergo præcipiens passioni Dominicæ esse communicandum & suauiter atque vtiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro eius crucifixa & vulnerata sit.

[c] Pag. 415. editione Augustæ. ὥστε καὶ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ πιστοῦ λαμβανόμενον σῶμα χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς αἰδητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται, καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτος· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα δὲ πνευματικὸν καὶ ἁπλοῦν τὸ αἰσθητὸν τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ὕδατος λέγω, διασώζει καὶ τὸ πρότερον τῆς αἰδητῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ὕδατος λόγω, διασώζει

excellent place, for it ſheweth in what ſence the ancient Fathers called the Sacrament the body of Chriſt, ſeeing it is ſaid, that it keepeth his firſt ſenſible ſubſtance, that is, the ſubſtance of bread, euen as the ſubſtance of water remaineth in Baptiſme.

Virgilius in his fourth booke againſt *Eutyches*, ſaith,** *If the Word and the fleſh haue but one nature, how commeth it to paſſe, that the Word being in all places, the fleſh alſo is not in all places? for when it was here on earth, it was not in heauen; and now when it is in heauen, it is not here on earth.* Our aduerſaries ſeeke to defend themſelues againſt this place, by ſaying, that the fleſh of Chriſt is no more viſible here on earth. But this excuſe might as well haue ſerued the Eutychians, who ſaid alſo that the fleſh of the Lord is no more viſibly preſent. They diſpute therefore againſt *Virgilius*, and ioyne with the ancient heretickes. Furthermore *Virgilius* conceiues, that the fleſh of Ieſus Chriſt being on earth, was not in heauen neither viſibly nor inuiſibly. Whence it followeth, that he alſo meaneth, that the fleſh of our Lord being in heauen, is not on earth neither viſibly nor inuiſibly; otherwiſe there ſhould be no correſpondence betweene theſe two propoſitions, nor no conſequence in his diſcourſe.

Theodoretus diſputeth againſt the ſame heretickes, in his firſt Dialogue entituled Immoueable, where he ſaith, * *The Lord gaue the name of his body to the ſigne.* Nothing can bee more expreſly ſpoken.

There alſo *he calleth the ſigne his blond.*

And a little after he ſaith,** *Ieſus Chriſt honoured the viſible ſignes with the names of his body and of his blond, not hauing changed their nature, but hauing added grace to nature.* Euery word in this ſentence is of great force.

In the ſecond Dialogue, the *Eutychian* hereticke maintaineth the changing of the ſubſtance of the bread into fleſh after conſecration; thereby to inferre, that in like manner after the Incarnation of the Word, the fleſh was changed into the diuine ſubſtance. But ſee what *Theodoretus* * ſaith againſt it: *The myſticall ſignes do not change their nature after conſecration:*

** Si Verbi & carnis vna natura eſt, quomodo cùm verbum vbiq; ſit, non vbique inuenitur & caro? nã quando in terra fuit, non erat vtique in cœlo, & nunc quia in cœlo eſt, non eſt vtique in terra.*

* τὸ μὲν σῶμα τοῦ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ σύμβολον τὸ τοῦ σώματος * τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῶν τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίαν τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλών, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προσθείς.

** ἅγια γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας οὐσίας ἵσταται φύσεως, μένει γὰρ καὶ τὸ τῆς προτέρας καὶ εἴδους καὶ τὸ σχήματος καὶ τὸ εἶδος, &c.

creation: for they remaine and continue in their first substance, figure and forme, and are visible and palpable as before; but they are understood to be those things which they are made to be, and are beleeued and reuerenced as being made that which they are beleeued to be. So *Gentian Heruet* and *Bellarmine* translate it, and also the Greeke is cleare and manifest; and *Theodoretus* meaning cannot be otherwise expounded: for he disputed against an hereticke which affirmed that the substance of the bread and wine were changed in the Sacrament. But *Theodoretus* contradicting him, maintaineth necessarily that the substance of the bread and wine still remaineth. Adde hereunto, that there being question to shew that after the Incarnation, the substance of the flesh of our Lord remained, *Theodoretus* should haue spoken very improperly and against himselfe, if to shew it, he should haue alledged, that the substance of the bread being changed, the accidents and the apparence of bread remained. That had beene as much as if he had pleaded the Eutychians cause, that would haue, that the substance of the flesh of Christ being changed, the apparence thereof did remaine.

In like sort *Gelasius* in his book of two natures saith,** *And yet the substance and nature of bread and wine ceaseth not to remaine still. And certainely, the Image and Resemblance of the bodie and of the blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries.*

*Chrysostome** in his 82. Homilie vpon Saint *Matthew* saith, *When Iesus Christ gaue the mysteries, he gaue wine.*

Chrysostome, or whosoeuer is the author of the imperfect worke vpon Saint *Matthew*, in the eleuenth Homilie saith,*** *If it be a sinne and a dangerous thing to put the sanctified vessels to priuate vses, as Baltazar teacheth vs, who drinking in the sacred cups, lost both his kingdome and his life: if, I say, it is so dangerous a thing to put those sacred vessels to priuate vses, wherein the true body of Iesus Christ is not, but the misterie of his body is therein contained, how much more the vessels of our bodies?* It is to no purpose to say, that the Arrians did corrupt that booke: for the Arrians had no other opinion touching &c?

** Et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur.*

* pag. 500. edit. Comel.

** ἐν μυστηρίοις παραδόσεως, ἤγουν πράξεως.

*** Si ergo hæc vasa sanctissimis ad priuatos vsus, transferre periculosum est in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis eius continetur, quanto magis vasa corporis nostri,

ching that point, then thoſe that hold the orthodox all and true faith.

[a] ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος· ἀντίτυπα τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ οἱ μετα λαμβάνοντες τὸ φαινόμενον ἄρτον πνευματικῶς τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐσθίουσιν.

Saint *Macarius* the Egyptian in his 27. Homily [a] ſaith, *In the Church bread and wine is offered, being the figure of his fleſh and of his blood: and thoſe that participate in that bread which is ſeene, ſpiritually eate the fleſh of our Lord.*

Maximus, which hath made notes vpon *Denis* falſly ſurnamed the *Areopagite*, ſaith, σύμβολα ταῦτα καὶ οὐκ ἀλήθεια, *Theſe things are ſignes, and not the truth.*

Not to be too tedious, for a man might ſet downe a thouſand ſuch places, I will content my ſelfe with the producing of certaine Councels. In the volume of the Canons of the Councels of *Africa*, the 37. Canon ſaith, [b] *To the end (as the Lord himſelfe hath taught vs) that in the ſacred Service, we ſhould offer nothing but the body and the bloud of our Lord, that is, nothing but bread and wine mixed with water.* Here by the ordinance of a Councell, the expoſition of theſe words *My body and my bloud*, is ſet downe, that is, bread and wine mixed with water. And the ſame Canon is repeated in the Councell of Trulle, Canon 32.

[b] ἵνα ἐστοῖς ἁγίοις μηδὲν ἄλλο τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα θεσπίσηται ἔχειν, τοῦτο ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος, ὕδατι μεμιγμένος.

In like ſort the 2. Canon of the Councell of *Ancyra* forbiddeth Deacons that had ſacrificed to idols, any more *to preſent the bread & the cup.* And the laſt Canon ſaue two of the Councell of Neocesarea, forbiddeth Prieſts of country villages [c] *to giue the bread and the cup in the preſence of a Biſhop, or of a Prieſt of a towne.*

[c] ἢ πρεσβύτερος δίδοναι ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἢ πρωτίσιον.

The Councell of Conſtantinople holden anno 756. compoſed of 338. Biſhops, condemning images, expreſly ſpeaketh of this Sacrament, ſaying, *Behold the image of this quickening body, &c.* And a little after: *Ieſus Chriſt hath commanded that we ſhould ſet vpon the table an image totally choſen, to wit, the ſubſtance of bread, leſt that if it ſhould be figured by humane forme, idolatry might ſteale in.* A place which the ſecond Councell of Nice authoriſeth by condemning it. For nothing was pleaſing to that abominable Councell, but that which diſpleaſed God.

It is a mockery to ſay, that the Fathers ſpake in that manner,

ner, leſt they ſhould be vnderſtood by the Catechumeni, ſeeing that both their Sermons, and their bookes, and the Councels are not expreſly made for the Catechumeni, but for all the faithfull. And it is not credible that the Fathers ſpeaking to the faithfull, would lye for feare of offending the Catechumeni, which would haue been much more offended, if they had vnderſtood that the Fathers had told the faithfull one thing and them another. Much leſſe is it to be beleeued, that if the conſecrated hoaſt be Ieſus Chriſt himſelfe, that the Paſtors of the Church would haue perſwaded the Catechumeni that it is not ſo, ſeeing that at this day they make little children beleeue it. I know, that the Fathers ſpake of the myſteries of faith with more ſobriety before the Catechumeni; but it is one thing to ſpeake to the Catechumeni, and another thing to write and preach to the faithfull, as the Fathers in theſe places do.

Hier. in 1. ad Corinth c. 11. Euagrius lib. 4 hiſtor. cap. 35. Nicephorus lib. 1. cap. 16. Heſych. in Leuit. lib. 2. cap. 8 Euſebius li. 7. cap. 8. Auguſtinus contra literas Petiliani. lib. 2. cap. 23. Oportet eam carere varia rum illecebris voluptatum, vt corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti miniſtret.

Let vs adde hereunto the ancient cuſtomes. The Chriſtians in Saint *Pauls* time made a banket in the Church, wherein they did eate the remainder of the Sacrament. In many places they gaue that which was left, to little children: and in other places they burnt the reſt of the ſacred bread which was left. Saint *Ambroſe* in the booke of Widowes teacheth vs, that in his time they vſed women to adminiſter the body of our Lord: and yet he ſpeakes of Widowes. A thing which at this day would be held to be prophane, and which indeed would be very inconuenient, if tha whi ch were giuen them to beare and adminiſter, were the true and naturall body of the Sonne of God. Then alſo they gaue the Sacrament into the hands of the people, and ſometimes they ſuffered them to carrie it home to their houſes. * *Satyrus*, brother to Saint *Ambroſe*, hung it about his necke, and ſwam therewith. Things which would neuer haue been ſuffered, if they had beleeued that the bread had beene the true body of Chriſt. Alſo at that time they ſpake not of concomitance, nor of putting the whole body into euery drop of wine in the cup, nor of accidents without ſubſtance, nor of a body without a place. They vſed no eleuation or lifting vp of the hoſt, and the people reuerenced

* *Ambroſius oratione de obitu fratris Satyri.*

the ſymbols and the ſignes, but adored not the Sacrament as God. They adored Ieſus Chriſt in the action of the Euchariſt, not as being incloſed in the bread, but as being in heauen at the right hand of God. And the conſecration of the bread was not made by theſe words, *This is my body*, but by prayer. *Iuſtin Martyr* at the end of his ſecond Apologie, called that which they receiued in the holy Supper. *A meate conſecrated by the prayer of the Word proceeding from God. S. Auguſtine* in his fourth Chapter and third booke of the Trinity, ſaith, *That which is taken from the fruits of the earth and conſecrated by myſticall prayer. Theodoretus* alledged before, bringeth in the Hereticke ſpeaking in this manner, * *The ſignes of the body and of the blond are one thing before the inuocation made by the Prieſt, but after inuocation they are changed and made other things. Origen* in his 8. booke againſt *Celſus* ſaith, * *We eate loaues of bread, which by prayer are made a bodie, which is ſome holy thing. Baſil* in his booke of the holy Spirit, cap. 27. if that booke be his, calleth *The words of the inuocation when they ſhew the bread.* Which ſhewing of the bread was not done by lifting vp a round wafer ouer the Prieſts head, but by drawing of curtaines which hung betweene the table and the people: as Saint *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, in his third Homilie vpon the Epiſtle to the Epheſians. Then conſecration was done before they ſaid theſe words, *This is my body*, which Pope *Innocent* the third acknowledgeth, as we haue already ſhewed.

ἔστω τοίνυν δὶ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένη τροφή.

* ἀλλὰ εἰσὶ μὲν τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως. * ἄρτος ἐφίεται μὲν σώματος μένος δὲ τῷ εὐχῇ ἁγιον, ἐπιτελεῖται δὲ ἀνελίσσεται τὰ ἀμφιάσματα τότε τὸ μυστικὸν ἅλλεται τὸ ἱερεῖον.

That which deceiueth many men, is diuers bookes falſly attributed to the ancient Fathers, as the booke of the Supper of our Lord attributed to Saint *Cyprian*: the Catecheticall Prayers of *Gregory Niſſen*: the Catechelis Myſtagogicke placed at the end of *Cyrils* Catechiſme: and diuers the like falſe bookes, which were not brought forth till many yeeres after the death of the authors of whom they beare the name, the ſtyle and doctrine whereof wholly repugneth the authors to whom they are attributed.

With the like abuſe they produce the Oratorie amplifications of certain Fathers in their Homilies, where they ſpeake

of

of chewing and grinding the flesh of the Lord betweene their teeth, of thrusting their fingers into his wounds, of embracing his crosse, of making the altar red with the bloud of our Lord: of hote coales brought with tongs by Seraphins, &c. Excessiue speeches vsed to rauish the spirits of the auditors, and such as if a man presse according to the letter, would bring in a thousand absurdities.

But that which they stumble most at, is, that oftentimes in the ancient Fathers that which is receiued in the Eucharist, is called the body of Christ; and that they say, that the Priest with his sacred mouth maketh the body of Christ. But he that hath read the anciẽt Fathers, knoweth that they make two sorts of the body of Christ: one that was crucified for vs, the other which is receiued in the Eucharist, whereof the last is eaten by the faithfull, but the other can not be eaten with the mouth. Saint *Ierome* vpon the Epistle to the Ephesians saith: * *The flesh and the bloud of Christ is vnderstood two wayes, either that spirituall and diuine flesh, whereof he himselfe saith, My flesh is meate indeed; or that flesh which was crucified, and that bloud which was shed by the souldiers speare.* And the same Father in the second Distinction of Consecration saith: ** *We are permitted to eate of that hoast which is wonderfully made in remembrance of Christ. But it is not lawfull for any man to eate of that same hoast, which Christ offered vpon the tree of the Crosse.*

* 2. *De Consecr. Can. Duo pluciter intelliguntur caro Christi vel spiritualis illa atque diuina de qua ipse ait, Caro mea est vere cibus, vel caro ea quæ crucifixa est, & sanguis qui militis effusus est lanceæ.*

** *Can. De hac quidem hostia quæ in Christi commemoratione mirabiliter fit, edere licet. De illa verò quam Christus in ara crucis obtulit secundum se nulli edere licet.*

Saint *Augustine* oftentimes speaketh of eating the body of Christ: but to the end that men should know that it is another body then that which was crucified, writing vpon the 98. Psalme, he produceth Iesus Christ speaking in this manner: *You shall not eate this body which you see, neither shall you drinke the bloud which those that crucifie me, shall shead.* What body then do they eate? He expoundeth it himselfe and saith: *I haue recommended a Sacrament vnto you, which being taken spiritually, will giue you life.*

So before we heard *Origen* call the bread of the Eucharist, *the symbolicall body of Christ*; and a body which in some sort is an holy thing, to discerne it from the naturall body. And S. *Cyprian*

Cyprian in his third Epiſtle of his ſecond booke ſaith,* *Corpus Domini non poteſt eſſe farina ſola, nec aqua ſola: The body of our Lord cannot be meale alone, nor water alone: becauſe meale muſt be kneaded with water.* There alſo he will haue water to be mixed with wine, becauſe wine is the bloud of Chriſt, and water the people, for that the bloud of Chriſt muſt not be without the people.

* *Si vinum tantùm quis offerat, ſanguis Chriſti incipit eſſe ſine noqis, ſi verò aqua ſola ſit, plebs incipit eſſe ſine Chriſto.*

Ephraim, whom we haue before alledged, ſaith, that the body of Chriſt which the faithfull receiue, loſeth not his ſenſible ſubſtance, euen as water in Baptiſme is ſtill water. It is clearer then the day-light, that by the body of Chriſt, he vnderſtandeth not the naturall body of our Lord, ſeeing he maketh that body in the Euchariſt to be the ſame that water is in Baptiſme, that is, an externall ſigne. And *Ephraim* ſhould in vaine ſay, that the naturall body of Ieſus Chriſt doth not loſe his ſubſtance in the Euchariſt; for who euer imagined that the naturall body of our Lord loſeth his ſubſtance in the holy Supper, or ceaſeth to be a man?

The ſame alſo appeareth by this, that the Fathers oftëtimes ſpeake of pieces or parts of the body of Chriſt, which are giuen to the people in the Euchariſt, which can not be ſaid of the crucified body.

* *Comperimus quòd quidam ſumpta tantummodo corporis ſacri portione à ea-lice ſacrati cruoris abſtineant.*

So in the Canon, * *Comperimus*, in the ſecond Diſtinction of Conſecration, Pope *Gelaſius* complaineth of *ſome that hauing taken a part of the body of Chriſt, abſtained from the cup.*

Gregorie Niſſen, in his booke of Baptiſme, ſaith, that the conſecrated bread is no more common bread, but is called, and is the body of Chriſt. But he declareth how it is bread, and yet is the body of Chriſt, by the ſimilitude of the water in Baptiſme, and of the ſtones of an altar, which are of the ſame nature that others are, but become holy by bleſſing. By theſe examples he manifeſtly excludeth tranſſubſtantiation. The place is long and worthy to be read.

This being ſo, it will not be very hard to perceiue how S. *Ambroſe* will haue the bread ſtill continuing bread, neuertheleſſe to become the body of Chriſt by diuine vertue. Which he declareth in the fourth Chapter of the fourth booke of Sacraments,

craments, where he propoundeth this queſtion, *Hoc igitur aſtruamus, quomodo poteſt qui panis eſt, eſſe corpus Chriſti: Let vs ſhew, how that which is bread, may be the body of Chriſt.* By which queſtion it appeares, that he will haue it bread and Chriſts body at the ſame time. And thereupon he produceth diuers Works of God, whereby he hath made things to be that which they were not. And ſo inferreth, that by great reaſon God can make things that were, to be the ſame ſtill, and yet to be changed into other things. His words are theſe: *Si ergo tanta vis eſt in ſermone Domini Ieſu, vt inciperent eſſe qui non erant, quanto magis operatorius eſt vt ſint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur? Then if there be ſuch vertue in the words of our Lord, to make thoſe things that were not, to begin to be, how much more can he make thoſe things that were before, to be the ſame that they were, and yet be changed into another thing?* He will haue the bread to remaine bread, and neuertheleſſe to be the body of Chriſt.

Howbeit, ſuch kindes of ſpeaking haue beene ſtumbling blocks, at which the ages enſuing haue ſtumbled, ſpecially ſince the holy Scriptures haue beene hidden from the people: and that men to aduance themſelues aboue Angels, haue boaſted that they make God with words, & create their Creator.

An anſwer to the Proſopopœia of M. Arnoux.

Now I thinke we ſhall eaſily anſwer *M. Arnoux* Proſopo- 34. *Sect.*
pœia, in which he preſcribeth God what he ſhould ſay, and makes God demand of vs at the latter day, why we haue contradicted his foure Euangeliſts? why we quarrell with his Church? and why we haue placed a figure in ſtead of the truth? He ought rather to examine himſelfe, and to thinke how he ſhall make anſwer vnto God: and what reaſon he will yeeld vnto him for making himſelfe to be an aduocate of a doctrine cleane contrary to the Goſpell? Why he hath ſung Maſſe, in ſtead of adminiſtring the holy Supper of the Lord? Why he hath intruded himſelfe to ſacrifice the body

of

of our Lord without commandement? Why he hath vſurped the office of a ſacrificing Prieſt not ordained by Ieſus Chriſt? Why he hath liſted vp an hoaſt in the Maſſe to cauſe it to be adored as God, ſeeing that Ieſus Chriſt vſed no ſuch eleuation, nor the Apoſtles any adoration? Why he hath ſung particular Maſſes without communicating, or any aſſiſtants, ſeeing that the Apoſtle calleth the Supper a communion? and that the Lord communicated to all the aſſiſtants? and that the word *cœna*, ſignifieth a common Supper? Why he did not communicate the cup vnto the people, ſeeing Ieſus Chriſt ſaid, *Drinke ye all of this*? Why he ſpeakes in the Maſſe in an vnknowne tongue not vnderſtood by the people, contrary to the example of Ieſus Chriſt? why he turnes his backe to the people, ſeeing that Ieſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt turned his face vnto his diſciples? Why in ſaying Maſſe he prayeth for ſaluation by the merits of thoſe Saints, whoſe bones are hidden vnder the altar, ſeeing that Ieſus Chriſt cauſed not any dead bones to be layd vnder the table? and that ſalnation is not gotten or obtained by mens merits? Why the Euãgeliſts hauing ſaid that Ieſus Chriſt brake, and gaue bread, he hath taken vpon him to teach, that the Prieſt doth not breake nor giue bread in the Maſſe? Why Ieſus Chriſt hauing ſaid of that bread which he gaue, that it was his body; he hath taught, That that bread is no more bread, but becõmeth the body of Chriſt? Why he durſt belye the Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, who foure times ſaith, that we breake and eate bread? Why, ſeeing that the holy Sacrament is inſtituted for the remiſſion of ſinnes, he hath winked at the prophanation thereof vſed in the Church of Rome, to ſay Maſſe for horſes, & ſicke hogs, and to ſing particular Maſſes to draw ſoules out of Purgatorie, if they be rich mens ſoules that haue ginen ſomething to the Church? What can theſe venerable Doctors anſwer thereũto? Will they ſay, Lord, the Church hath iudged otherwiſe, and hath found it conuenient to change the inſtitution of this Sacrament, and his Vicar the Pope may diſpence againſt the Apoſtles, and againſt the Goſpell, in giuing it interpretations. Do they thinke that ſuch excuſes

will

will be admitted in that fearefull iudgement, or that thereby they can defend themſelues from the heate of that fire that ſhall conſume the aduerſaries?

But theſe repugnances, in ſuch things which are the grounds and the very Eſſence of this holy Sacrament, and which make part of the action, are other matters then ſuch as they obiect againſt vs, when they aske vs, Why we do not celebrate the holy Supper after ſupper? why we do it not in an high chamber, and why we admit women vnto it? They ought to adde hereunto, and aske vs, Why we are not apparelled like Iewes, and why we do not celebrate it only vpon a Thurſday, and after we haue eaten a Lambe? Which are ridiculous queſtions, made to exempt themſelues from anſwering to their corruptions, which deſtroy the whole nature of Sacraments. Among the which the taking away of the cup from the Laity requireth ſome large diſcourſe.

Of taking away the Cup in the holy Supper, or of the Communion vnder one kind onely.

1. Our Lord giuing the Cup to his diſciples, ſaid vnto them, *Drinke yee all of this.* The Church of Rome correcteth that, and ſaith, *You ſhall not all drinke thereof*, for to drinke at the Maſſe, is the priuiledge of Prieſts, and of Kings and Princes. 35. *Sect.*

2 They make anſwer and ſay, that Ieſus Chriſt ſpake onely to Paſtors, for all thoſe that then were preſent, were Paſtors of the Church. But the Church of Rome giuing the Cup to Kings and Princes, ſheweth that ſhe doth not beleeue, That that Commandement was made onely to Paſtors of the Church.

3. Moreouer, Ieſus Chriſts Diſciples being with him, were not as Paſtors, but as ſheepe and diſciples, and in that action are alſo called diſciples.

4. It is manifeſt, that in the inſtitution of the Supper, the

commandement to eate and drinke was indifferently made to those persons that were present. And if the people are not bound to communicate in the cup, because those to whom Iesus gaue it were Pastors; by the same reason the people may dispence with themselues touching the participation of the bread, vnder pretence that those were Pastors, to whom Iesus Christ said, *Eate*. And so there is nothing in the whole institution of the Sacrament, which bindeth the people to receiue any of the two kinds, nor yet at all to participate this Sacrament. What is he that can iudge or discerne that these words of our Lord, *Take, eate*, are directed to the Pastors and to the people, but that these words *Drinke ye all of this*, are onely directed to Pastors? There is nothing then in the institution of the Supper which directeth the faithfull, and yet the institution of a Sacrament is the rule it selfe. And though we looke elsewhere for the commandement to eate made to the people, we shall alwayes finde that there also is mention made of drinking.

5. Our aduersaries themselues confesse, that Iesus Christ by these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, commanded his disciples to do the same to the faithfull, that he did to them: He commanded therefore to giue the cup to the faithfull.

6. Besides, our Lord administring the cup, said, *That it is the new Testament in his bloud, which is shed for the remission of sinnes*. Then it appeareth, that to depriue the people of the cup, is as much as to depriue them of the shedding of his bloud for the remission of sinnes. For our aduersaries say, that there is no effusion of bloud in the host.

7. And when Iesus said, *This is my body which is giuen and broken for you*, did he vnderstand that it should onely be giuen for Pastors, or broken for their saluation, and not for the saluation of the people? And if it be impious to affirme that touching the body, why should it be lesse impious to be said touching the cup?

8. S. *Paul* 1. Cor. 11. cutteth off all euasions; for he writeth to the Corinthians, & as he himselfe saith, cap. 1. verse 2.

to

to all thoſe that call vpon the name of Ieſus, and ſaith vnto them, *Let a man examine himſelfe, and ſo let him eate of that bread, and drinke of that cup.* Euen as the commandement to examine himſelfe is made to all the faithfull, ſo the commandement to eate of that bread and to drinke of that cup, is made to all the faithfull. He ſaith not (as ſome affirme) Examine your ſelues before you drinke. The Greeke hath ἐσθιέτω, *Let him eate*, which is the Imperatiue moode, and a word of commandement, and not a conditionall word, *if he will eate, or when he would eate, let him examine himſelfe.* If the King ordained that a ſouldier ſhould arme himſelfe, and that he ſhould fight courageouſly, he commandeth him to arme himſelfe & to fight: ſo when the Apoſtle ſaith to the faithfull, that they ſhould examine themſelues, and that they ſhould eate and drinke that bread and that wine, he commandeth them both to examine themſelues, and to eate that bread and drinke that wine. And if the Apoſtle had ſaid no otherwiſe, but that the faithfull muſt examine themſelues before they drinke, he would preſuppoſe thereby that the faithfull dranke, and that in Corinth the people participated in the cup.

9. It is true, that it ſufficeth to receiue one of the *ſpecies* vnworthily, to make a man culpable; whereupon the Apoſtle ſaith, *Whoſoeuer ſhall eate the bread, or drinke this cup of the Lord vnworthily, ſhall be guilty of the body and bloud of the Lord.* But that hindreth not the faithfull from participating both in the one and the other kinde. Yet I am not of opinion, that a man that taketh one of the *ſpecies* vnworthily, can take the other worthily.

10. But the nature of falſhood ſpecially appeareth in this, that it contradicteth it ſelfe. For when Ieſus Chriſt, Iohn 6. ſaid, *Except you eate the fleſh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, you haue no life in you*, our aduerſaries expreſly affirme and maintaine, that Ieſus Chriſt ſpake of the Euchariſt, and of eating with the mouth: treading the authority of Pope *Innocent* 3. vnder their feete, that determined the contrary, as we haue ſhewed before. Howbeit by this they make a proceſſe againſt themſelues, and teſtifie, that as much as in them lyeth,

ieth, they deprive the people of life eternall. For it is ſaid, *If you drinke not, you haue no life in you.*

Their anſwer is, That the bloud is alſo in the hoaſt, and that in taking the body, we take the bloud alſo. This libertie is horrible. For to take the bloud vnder the hoſt, is not to drinke; but Ieſus Chriſt commandeth vs to drinke, ſaying, *If you drinke not, &c.*

If to take the drie hoſt, is to drinke, we muſt ſay that the Prieſt drinkes twice in the Maſſe, once when he takes the hoaſt, the other when he takes the cup. Which diſcouereth the childiſh ſubtilty of thoſe that ſay, that Ieſus Chriſt in this place of Saint *Iohn* doth not expreſſe the manner how to communicate, but ſheweth the ſubſtance of the thing. For he ſpeaketh of drinking, and drinking is the manner of communicating. Is there any hope euer to bring theſe men to reaſon, that play with the Word of God, & perceiuing themſelues to be grounded, haue their recourſe to ſuch ridiculous defences, as to maintaine that to eate the hoſt, is to drinke? If we take eating and drinking for beleeuing (as Ieſus Chriſt in this Chapter expoundeth it) it is certaine, that to eate and to drinke are all one thing. But betweene eating the Sacrament with the mouth, and drinking, there is great difference.

11. Adde hereunto, that he which taketh the bloud vnder the hoſt, taketh it not as being ſhed for vs, nor with the Sacrament of the ſhedding of his bloud, which is the manner, whereby Ieſus Chriſt will haue euery man to participate in the ſame. The faithful in eating the bread, may remember the ſhedding of his bloud, but God will haue the memorie and the exterior ſigne to go together. And we muſt not content our ſelues with the memory, to aboliſh a part of the Sacrament, becauſe it is inſtituted to celebrate the memorie of the ſhedding of the bloud. For, if the memory of the ſhedding of the bloud were ſufficient without participating in the Sacrament of the ſhedding of the bloud, we might alſo diſpence with our ſelues for participating in the Sacrament of the bodie, for that the preaching of the Word might refreſh our memories therein.

12. The

13 The ambition of the Clergy hath begotten this monſter. [a] For by giuing the Cup to none but to Prieſts and to Kings and Princes, Prieſts haue made themſelues companions with Kings in the ſame manner as the Pope hath exalted himſelfe aboue the Cleargie, in diſdaining to drinke out of the Chalice, and ſucking by drops out of a quill which is put into the Cup, and giuing the reſt to the Deacon. A cuſtome, which hauing been practiſed in the latter times by ſome ambitious Prelates, is now reſerued for the Pope onely, for a marke of his greatneſſe. [b] *Gerſon* in his ſecond Treatiſe of the Communion vnder both kindes, puts this among the cauſes why the people ſhould be depriued of the Cup, to wit, that thereby the dignity of Lay-men would be equall with the Prieſts. Their onely intent therefore herein is the honour and exaltation of the Clergie.

[a] *Lib. 2. Sauarum ceremoniarum cap. 14. Epiſcopus Cardinalis perrigit calamum quem Papa ponit in calice in manibus Diaconi exiſtente, & ſanguinis partẽ ſugit.*

[b] *Tanta eſſet dignitas laicorũ circa ſumptionem corporis Chriſti ſicut & ſacerdotum.*

The Councell of Conſtance holden *anno* 1416. which is the firſt Councell that forbad the Cup to be adminiſtred to the people, vpon paine of hereſie, and puniſhment to be impoſed by the ſecular powers, confeſſeth that Ieſus Chriſt did inſtitute the holy Supper vnder both kinds, & that the primitiue Church did ſo practiſe it. Neuertheleſſe it ſaith, that the contrary cuſtome ought to be holden for a law; and declareth all thoſe to be heretickes and puniſhable which contradict it. You ſhall ſee the whole Canon, which (as error loueth darkneſſe) thoſe Fathers haue purpoſely obſcured, promiſcuouſly handling it with the queſtion touching the receiuing of the Euchariſt after Supper. The words of the Canon are theſe:

Seeing that in ſome parts of the world, ſome men dare raſhly affirme, that Chriſtian people ought to receiue the Sacrament of the Euchariſt vnder both kinds, and ordinarily giue the Communion to the Laitie, not onely vnder the forme of bread, but alſo vnder the forme of wine, and that after ſupper, or otherwiſe not faſting; and obſtinately affirme that it muſt be ſo communicated contrary to the laudable cuſtome of the Church, reaſonably brought in; which they damnably ſeeke to reproue as ſacrilegious. For this cauſe, this preſent ſacred generall Councell of Conſtance, lawfully aſſembled by the holy Ghoſt, againſt this error, ſeeking to prouide for the

ſaluation of the faithfull, after ripe deliberation had by diuers Doctors as well ſpirituall as temporall, declareth, decreeth, and deſineth, that although Ieſus Chriſt after Supper did inſtitute and adminiſter to his Diſciples this venerable Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wine; notwithſtanding, the authority of the ſacred Canons, and the commendable and approued cuſtomes of the Church haue declared, and do declare, that this Sacrament ought not to be celebrated after Supper, nor by the faithfull to be receiued but faſting, vnleſſe it be in caſe of weakeneſſe or other neceſſities permitted by the law or by the Church. And likewiſe, that although in the primitiue Church this Sacrament was receiued by the faithfull vnder both kindes, neuertheleſſe this cuſtome hath with reaſon been induced, that it ſhould be taken by thoſe that conſecrate, vnder both kindes, and by the Laity vnder the forme of bread onely. For that we muſt conſtantly, and without any doubt beleeue, that the whole bodie and bloud of Ieſus Chriſt is truly contained as well vnder the forme of bread, as vnder the forme of wine. Therefore, ſeeing that this cuſtome hath been reaſonably induced, and long time practiſed by the Church and by the holy Fathers, it muſt be holden for a law, which it is not lawfull to reprooue, or to change at our fancieſies without the authoritie of the Church. Therefore to affirme, that to obſerue this cuſtome or law, it is ſacrilege or an vnlawfull thing, that opinion ought to be held to be erroneous; and thoſe that obſtinately affirme the contrary of that which is ſaid before, ought to be baniſhed as hereticks, and grieuouſly puniſhed by the Dioceſans of the places where they reſide, or by their Officials, or by the Inquiſitors of hereticall peruerſities, &c. To ſpeake in this manner, what is it elſe but to ſpit in the face of the Sonne of God, and to tread the Goſpell vnder their feete?

An examination of the Reaſons alledged by our Aduerſaries.

Sect. 36. To maintaine this errour againſt the Word of God, they alledge certaine weake reaſons of humane wiſedome: as if mens reaſon might contrary the Goſpell; or as if our aduerſa-

ries

ries were ſharper ſighted then Ieſus Chriſt, or as if they could propound ſome inconuenience which Chriſt did not foreſee. *Gerſon* that was at the Councell of Conſtance, propoundeth the reaſons that moued the Councell to prohibite the Cup vnto the people.

1 He ſaith, that there would be danger leſt any drop of the wine ſhould fall downe vpon the ground. But he ſhould rather beware leſt he fall into diſobedience, or to ſuffer the authority of the Word of God to fall downe.

2 He ſaith, that it is done, leſt the common people ſhould wet their beards in the cup. But it were better that men were without beards then without the Sacrament of the blond of Ieſus Chriſt: and yet women and yong men without beards might communicate without danger.

3 As alſo leſt the Chalice being kept, ſhould take winde, or waxe ſowre. But that is to take great care for Ieſus Chriſt. For if he be preſent and whole in euery drop of wine within the Cup, his preſence would be ſufficient to keepe the wine from ſowring: ſeeing that (if you beleeue our aduerſaries) the milke of the virgin *Marie* waxeth not ſowre, nor the bones of Saints putrifie in ſo many hundred yeeres. To ſpeake nothing of this new Philoſophy, which giueth vs ſharpe lines, puffed vp in length and breadth.

4 They alſo alledge, that thereby the Church of Rome ſought to ſtop another hereſie. But we muſt not remedy one euill by another, nor an error by an abuſe: neither ſhall it euer be found that the prohibiting of the chalice did remedie any error, but onely that it ſerueth to ſtrengthen the error of Tranſubſtantiation.

5 They likewiſe ſay, that ſome countries haue no wine. I anſwer alſo, that there are countries that haue no bread; and that if men can carry the one thither, they may carry the other alſo: or if that be impoſſible, it is better in ſuch a countrey to vſe that which ſerueth there in ſtead of bread and wine, rather then to be wholly or in part depriued of the Sacrament. And that if there be ſuch a countrey whereunto men cannot carry wine, the ſame diſcõmoditie happeneth as well to the Prieſts

as to the people. Adde thereunto, that if ſome countries cannot haue wine for the Sacrament, it followeth not but that they may be furniſhed from an infinit number of other prouinces where they may haue wine. This conſideration is as badly grounded, as if I ſhould ſay, that we muſt not heare the Word of God, becauſe thoſe that are deafe cannot heare it: that ſo in matter of inſtruction to ſaluation, there may be no difference among men.

6 Laſtly, our aduerſaries (as they ſuppoſe) find examples in the new Teſtament of celebrating the Euchariſt without the Cup. Put caſe that ſuch examples were to be found, what would that make for them? For the queſtion betweene vs is not, whether the holy Supper may be adminiſtred without the Cup; but, whether the Cup being there, the Prieſt alone, and not the people ought to drinke? Therefore they vainely alledge the 2. of Acts 42. verſe, where it is ſaid, that *they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles doctrine and fellowſhip, and in breaking of bread, and prayer.* And Acts 20. 7. where it is ſaid, that *the Diſciple came together to breake bread.* In theſe places it is not ſaid, that there was a cup, whereof the Paſtor dranke, and the people dranke not. And if vnder pretence, that in theſe places there is nothing ſpoken of drinking, it followeth that the people ſhould not drinke; it will follow thereby, that Paſtors alſo ought not to drinke; for there is nothing ſpoken in thoſe places of them touching that.

It ſhould be a ridiculous conſequence, if I ſhould ſay, that in the 31. of Geneſis it is ſaid, that *Iacob* inuited his brethren to eate bread with him, and therefore that they dranke not. It is the ordinary manner of the Scripture, by bread to vnderſtand all that is ſet vpon the table at meale times, Gen. 37. 25. Luke 7. 36. and often in other places. And there is no reaſon why this manner of ſpeaking ſhould not be allowed in a ſacred Supper, as well as in a common repaſt. So there was no beaſt ſacrificed vnder the Law, without ſome aſperſion of wine, and yet in all the ſacred hiſtory, where is it ſaid, that ſuch a King or Prieſt did offer ſacrifice, there is nothing ſpoken of ſprinkling of wine. For, as to know how men ought

to

to celebrate ſacrifices, we need not ſeeke in Hiſtories or examples, but we muſt go to the rules thereof contained in the bookes of *Moſes*: ſo to know how the Sacraments ought to be celebrated, we muſt not haue recourſe to examples ſummarily recited, but to the rules, and to the firſt inſtitution thereof.

In Pope *Gelaſius* time, that liued in anno 495. this abuſe began to ſpring vp, againſt the which the ſaid Pope pronounced this ſentence, ſaying: *We haue beene aduertiſed that ſome perſons hauing onely taken a piece of the ſacred body, do abſtaine from the Cup of the ſacred bloud, who without doubt (becauſe it is ſaid that they are led by I know not what ſuperſtition) ought either to receiue the whole Sacrament, or to be wholly exclud. d from communicating: becauſe the diuiſion of a Sacrament cannot i e done without great ſacriledge.* Note theſe words, *ſhould be driuen away*: that men ſhould not thinke that he ſpake onely to Paſtors.

* *Diſt 2 De Conſecr. Can. Comperimus quòdquidam ſumpta tantummodo corporis ſacri portione, à calice ſacrati cruoris abſtineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam neſcio qua ſuperſtitione dicuntur aſtringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia diuiſio vnius euiſdemque myſterij ſine grandi ſacrilegio non poteſt prouenire.* Thereupon the Gloſſe ſaith, *Hoc intelligo de conficiente, nam infirmus vel ſanus in neceſſitate ſine vino corpus ſumere poteſt.*

A meanes of agreement.

Some men deſirous of peace, and calling to minde the great quantitie of bloud that hath beene ſhed, and the miſeries and deſolations that haue happened among Chriſtians, the wounds whereof ſtill bleed, and whereon at this day men powre vineger and not oyle, will ſay vnto themſelues, Is there no meanes of reconciliation? is the miſchiefe ſo deſperate? Certainely the agreement is very eaſie, and to be made by ſo iuſt and eaſie meanes, that no man can contradict it without making open warre againſt God, and declaring himſelfe to be degenerated from the bloud of his brethren, whom Ieſus Chriſt redeemed with his bloud. For all men confeſſe, that Ieſus Chriſt did inſtitute the holy Sacrament as it ſhould be, 37. Sect.

and that there is nothing to be contradicted therein: Then let the Pope reſtore the holy Supper to the ſame forme that Ieſus Chriſt did inſtitute it; let men ſpeake in this action as Ieſus Chriſt ſpake; let them do as he did, without further diſputation, and then wee will willingly aſſemble together with them, that we may with one accord glorifie God. If that were done, there would be no Maſſes without communicants: the Seruice would not be done in a ſtrange language: all men ſhould communicate vnder both kindes, there ſhould be no adoration nor lifting vp of the hoſt; neither ſhould the Prieſt, bowing himſelfe vpon the altar, require remiſſion of ſinnes from God by the merits of the Saints whoſe bones are hid vnder the altar. But the aduocates of the Maſſe are growne to ſuch a pride and contempt of the Sonne of God, that they preſume that the Church of Rome doth better then Ieſus Chriſt, and that many things are wanting in his inſtitution: alledging to that effect the ſaying of the Apoſtle Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 11. 34. *And the reſt will I ſet in order when I come.* But the Apoſtle ſaith not, that he would change any thing in the Lords inſtitution, or that he would eſtabliſh any thing contrary to that which the Sonne of God had commanded. He ſpeaketh not of eſſentiall things, nor of that which God hath cómanded or prohibited, as adoration, Seruice in an vnknowne language, propitiatory ſacrifice, the communion of the faithfull, and the participation of the Cup, which are eſſentiall points in religion, and wherein if wee would conforme our ſelues after the example of Ieſus Chriſt, wee ſhould be at an agreement. The Apoſtle ſpeakes of circumſtances, and of exterior order, which concernes comelineſſe and not neceſſitie, as the Councell of Trent acknowledgeth; for which things we would not ſtriue, ſo the ſubſtance might remaine, and that humane conſtitutions were not made equall with Gods inſtitution.

Trid. Concil. Seſſ. 21. cap. 2.

THE

THE XXIX. ARTICLE.

Of the Confession of the Faith.

We beleeue, that God will haue the world to bee gouerned by lawes and policies, that there might be some restraint of the disordered desires of the world. And as he hath established kingdomes and commonwealths and all other kinds of principalities, whether they be hereditary or otherwise, & all that belongeth to the state of iustice, and will be knowne to be the anthor thereof: so hath he put the sword into the Magistrates hands, to represse sinnes, committed not onely against the second table of the Commãdements of God, but also against the first. Therefore in regard of him, we must not onely endure and suffer superiors to gouerne, but also we must honour and obey them with all reuerence: holding them for his Lieutenants and officers, whom he hath appointed to exercise a lawfull and an holy charge.

THE XL. ARTICLE.

We say then, that we must obey their lawes and statutes, pay all tributes and impostes, and other duties, and beare the yoke of subiection with a good and free will, although they be infidels. So that Gods Empire may flourish and be vndefaced. And therefore we detest those that would reiect superiority, and establish cõmunity of goods, & ouerthrow all course of iustice.

38. *Sect.* Vpon the 30. Article of our Confeſſion, wherein we ſpeake not any thing of Kings nor Magiſtrates, *M. Arnoux* ſpeaketh of vs, as of thoſe that are enemies to all humane order, and which teach men to ſhake off the yoke of lawes and Magiſtrates. But againſt theſe two Aricles, wherein we ſpeake of ſubiection and fidelitie to Magiſtrates, as of a neceſſary thing ordained by God, he ſaith nothing, and ſo iuſtifieth vs by his ſilence. Either becauſe our innocencie is knowne vnto him, and our Confeſſion touching this point ſo expreſſe, that it confuteth all ſorts of ſlanders: or becauſe he hath been ſtriken with ſome remorſe of conſcience, and is aſhamed to ſpeake any thing in this matter for the obedience due to Magiſtrates, knowing well that the Popes power, and the doctrine of the Ieſuites, wholly tend to the ſubuerſion of Empires, exempteth Clergy men from the ſubiection of Kings, and putteth the liues and the Crownes of ſoueraigne Princes into the Popes power. Which moueth vs to ſpeake briefly of theſe two things: Firſt, of the exemption of ſpirituall perſons from temporall power: Secondly, of the Popes power to giue and take away kingdomes.

Of the exemption of the Clergy.

39. *Sect.* The Councell of Conſtance in the 31. Seſſion, declareth that [a] *the Laity* (that is to ſay, Kings and Princes) *haue no iuriſdiction nor authority ouer Clergy men.* The Councell of Trent in the 25. Seſſion and 20. chapter ſaith, that [b] *The exemption of Eccleſiaſticall perſons was inſtituted by the ordinance of God, and by canonicall conſtitutions. Bellarmine* in the eight and twentieth chapter of his booke of Clerkes, ſaith, [c] *That Clerkes may not be puniſhed by the ciuill Iudge, nor by any meanes be brought before the Iudgement-ſeates of ſecular Magiſtrates.*

[a] *Laici in clericos nullam habent iuriſdictionem & poteſtatem.*

[b] *Perſonarum Eccleſiaſticarum immunitas Dei ordinatione & canonicis ſanctionibus inſtituta eſt.*

[c] *Clerici non poſſunt à Iudice politico puniri, vel ullo modo trahi ad ſeculares magiſtratus tribunal.*

ſtrates. And in the ſame place he ſaith, * *The ſouereaigne Biſhop hath exempted Clerkes from the ſubiection of Princes, and therefore Kings are no more Soueraignes ouer Clerkes.* And if our Kings and their Courts of Parliament do reſerue any iuriſdiction to themſelues ouer the Clergy, as Appeales, their regall right vpon vacant Benefices, tythes, and the patronage of certaine Benefices, then the Clergy rage, and cry out, and ſay that they violate the liberties of the Church. For the liberty which Ieſus Chriſt hath obtained of the Church, which conſiſteth in her deliuerance from the ceremonies of the Law, and in her deliuerance from the ſeruitude of ſinne and the diuell, at this day is conuerted into an exemption from all ſubiection to Magiſtrates, and into franchiſes and temporall immunities. And if the Magiſtrate taketh any knowledge of a crime committed by any Clerke, and layeth hand on him to puniſh him, (as not long ſince it happened in Venice) it is enough to thunder downe an Eſtate, and to threaten a common wealth to interdict it. And not to ſeeke for more proofes of ſo manifeſt a thing, the Pope yeerely on Maundy Thurſday thundreth out an excommunication againſt Kings and Magiſtrates that ſhall take any knowledge of the crimes and cauſes of Eccleſiaſticall perſons, or that ſhall raiſe any tythes of the Clergie. This is it which is called the Bull *de cœna Domini*, wherin all caſes reſerued to his Holines are orderly ſet downe.

* *Summus Pontifex cleros exemit a ſubiectione Principum, non ſunt amplius Reges Clericorum ſuperiores*

Theſe exemptions are a great preiudice and weakening to our Kings; partly in reſpect of the multitude of perſons that are withdrawne from the obedience of the King, which haue their Iudges and their priſons apart, and whoſe cauſes are carried to Rome by Appeale: and partly in regard of their goods and poſſeſſions; for the Clergie poſſeſſeth the third part of France, and the goodlieſt pieces of ground and houſes, vpon which the King loſeth his right. For a fœffee entring into the poſſeſſion of the Clergie, falleth into a Mortmaine, and oweth no more perſonall ſeruice to the King, to aide him in his neceſſitie: and in caſe of high treaſon, his goods cannot bee confiſcate, nor his perſons puniſhed, if it pleaſeth not the Biſhop to degrade him, that he may become a lay-man, and ſo puniſh-

able

able by the ſecular power. By this meanes the Pope hath erected an Eſtate temporall for himſelfe in the middle of the Eſtates of Chriſtian Kings. From hence it proceedeth that our Kings in a great kingdome raiſe ſmall armies, and that the Clergie waxing fat, the Nobility and the third eſtate become poore: as the armes and the legs waxe weake, when the belly ſwelleth with exceſſe; which cauſeth the head (which is the ſoueraigne Prince) to draw the leſſe ſeruice from them. Therefore it is not without cauſe, that many yeeres ſince Eccleſiaſticall perſons haue hidden the Scripture from our Kings, becauſe it ſpeaketh ſo expreſly touching this matter.

1 In the old Teſtament the Prieſts and the Leuites were ſubiects to Kings. It was not in the high Prieſts power to puniſh Leuites with corporall or pecuniary puniſhment.

2. King *Dauid* in the firſt chapter of the firſt of Kings calleth *Sadoc* the high Prieſt and *Nathan* the Prophet, his ſeruants, ſaying, *Take with you the ſeruants of your Lord, and let Sadoc the high Prieſt and Nathan the Prophet anoint him there King ouer Iſrael.*

3 In the ſecond chapter, verſe 26. King *Salomon* putteth *Abiathar* from the office of high Prieſt, and confineth him to Anathoth. And the actions done in the beginning of *Salomons* reigne are generally commended in the third Chapter, verſe 3.

4 In the 17. of Saint Mathew Ieſus Chriſt payed tribute, and Saint *Peter* with him. It cannot be ſaid that he did it for feare, ſeeing he had power enough to exempt himſelfe from it. It is true that being of the royall race, he had been exempted from paying tribute, if he had b in acknowledged in that quality, as he himſelfe ſaith in that place, *That the children of Kings are free.* But knowing that he could not alledge his royall deſcent to the collectors of tribute, without offending them, he ſubiected himſelfe thereunto, in that giuing vs an example to conforme our ſelues to do the like.

5 He himſelfe appeared before *Pilate* as before his lawfull Iudge, and *to whom that power was giuen from aboue*, Iohn 19. 11.

6 The

6 The Apoſtle Saint *Paul* appealeth to *Ceſar*, and not to *Peter*. Which he did not for feare, for he would not by feare preiudice the right of the Church: not by fraud, for Saint *Luke* Acts 23. 11. witneſſeth, that he did it by the motion of the Spirit of God, the Lord appearing vnto him in the night. Wherefore *Bellarmine* much wrongs himſelfe, to ſay, that Saint *Pauls* cauſe was for a point of religion, the knowledge whereof appertained not to the Magiſtrate. For in Acts 24. *Tertullus* accuſed *Paul* to haue raiſed ſedition, and Saint *Paul* 25. 8. defendeth himſelfe, by alledging that they accuſed him to haue offended *Ceſar*. *Cap 2. in Barkl.*

7 The Apoſtle Saint *Peter* in his firſt Epiſtle writeth to all the faithfull, and by conſequence to Paſtors of the Church. And therefore to them it is that in the 2. chapter and 13. verſe he ſaith, *Submit your ſelues to euery ordinance of man for the Lords ſake, whether it be to the King as ſupreme, or vnto Gouernours, as vnto them that are ſent by him.*

8 But Saint *Pauls* words, Romans 13. 1. are moſt expreſly ſet downe to that end, where he ſaith, *Let euery ſoule be ſubiect vnto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God, the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whoſoeuer therefore reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.* And leſt ſome Sophiſter ſhould thinke to auoide this, by ſaying that Clerkes or ſpirituall perſons are ſubiects to the Pope, and that he in reſpect of them is the ſuperiour power; the ſame Apoſtle in the fourth and ſixt verſes ſheweth, that he ſpeaketh of the power which beareth the ſword, and whereunto tribute is paied. But then, and long time after that, there was no ſuperiour power which bare the ſword, and to whom men payed tribute, but the power of ſecular Princes. The interlineat Gloſſe confeſſeth it, where vpon theſe words, *Poteſtatibus ſublimioribus*, the Gloſſe ſaith, *id eſt, ſecularibus bonis & malis.* And it is to be noted, that then *Nero* reigned, a Pagan Emperour, who as he was the greateſt, ſo he was the wickedeſt of all men, and a perſecutor of the Church, to whom neuertheleſſe S. *Paul* would haue Chriſtians yeeld obedience. Therefore *Chryſoſtome* in his 23. Homily vpon the Epiſtle to the Romans, expoũdeth that place

πᾶσι ταῦτα διατάττει λέγων· Ἀπόστολε καὶ προφῆτα καὶ εὐαγγελιστὰ καὶ μονάζοντες, οὐχὶ κληρικοῖς μόνον, κἂν ἀπόστολος εἶ κἂν εὐαγγελιστὴς κἂν προφήτης, κἂν ὁσίως ἔχῃς.

place in this manner, saying: *He commandeth that to all men, both to Priests, and cloyster men, and not onely to secular persons: Yea although thou art an Apostle, or an Euangelist, or a Prophet, or whatsoeuer thou art.*

9 And to the end that men should not say, that feare of punishment, or present necessitie drew those words from the Apostle, he saith that wee must be subiect to the higher powers, *Not onely because of wrath*, that is, not onely because we are afraid to offend the Prince, *but also for conscience sake.* And in the second verse he saith, *Whosoeuer therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.*

10 It is either in despite or in mockery, that *Bellarmine* in the 28. chapter of his booke of Clerkes, for the exemption of Clerkes alledgeth an example of the Egyptian Priests, that were not constrained to sell their lands through pouerty, as the other Egyptians were. For, doth it from thence follow, that their lands and possessions were exempted from tallages or tributes? and say they had been so, may a Pagan example serue for a law in the Church of God?

11 Reason also is most euident herein. For is it reasonable that the King should pay souldiers that go to warre, and that he should fortifie the frontiers of his kingdome, to the end that Clerkes and spirituall persons may sleepe securely, and that they should not contribute something towards his charge?

12 And being borne French men, and subiects to the King, why should that naturall subiection be defaced by their shauing? Or who can suffer that a French man, borne in France, of French parentage, should not be subiect to the King of France? and that in temporall things he should acknowledge another Soueraigne out of the Realme? and so be exempted from the commandement vnto which God in his Word bindeth all Christians?

13 This also is clearer then the day, that Christian Religion doth not depriue any man of his goods, nor of that lawfull power which he had before he was conuerted to the faith. All men confesse, that while King *Clouis* reigned, and

wes

was a Pagan, and all men generally were ſubiects vnto him, in all the countries contained within his kingdome. Then why ſhould his conuerſion to the faith depriue him of a part of his power, and exempt a part of his ſubiects (that is, ſpirituall perſons) from being puniſhable by ſecular Iudges.

14 And ſeeing that the ſoueraigne Prince ought to foreſee as much as poſſible he may how to preuent all diſorders that happen in his Realme, how can he do it, if one part of thoſe that liue in his Realme, & which poſſeſſe great wealth, are no ſubiects vnto him? Shall he without remedy therein taken, ſuffer certaine Clergie-men to corrupt the good manners of his ſubiects? or that they ſhould haue ſecret intelligence with ſtrangers? or that they ſhould conſpire treaſon againſt his life or againſt his State? And if a Biſhop being acceſſarie to the ſame crime, will not degrade a Clerke, ſhall he go vnpuniſhed?

15 The examples which *Bellarmine* produceth to defend this cauſe, ſufficiently ſhew what we muſt iudge of theſe exemptions. For in that the Pope ſeparateth marriages, and exempteth children from the obedience of their parents, he inferreth that he may alſo exempt Clerkes from due obedience to their ſoueraigne Princes: That is to ſay, that the Pope may diſannull the rule of Saint *Matthew* 19. 6. which ſaith, *What God hath ioyned together, let no man put aſunder:* And exempt children from the Commandement of God, which ſaith, *Honour thy father and thy mother, &c.* And, *Children obey your parents in all things, for that is well pleaſing vnto the Lord*, Coloſſ. 3. 20.

16. To ſay that Clergy men haue receiued theſe priuiledges from the liberality and courteſie of Princes, is to contradict the Pope and *Bellarmine*, who maintaine that the Pope hath exempted Clerks from this ſubiection, and that he may do it without asking counſell of any Prince. You muſt alſo know, that as a father cannot exempt his ſonne from obeying the Commandement of God, who will haue children to honour their fathers and mothers, and obey them; ſo a Prince cannot exempt one part of his ſubiects (aslong as they dwell in

in his realme) from ſubiection to puniſhment for their faults, ſeeing that ſubiection is ordained by the Word of God.

17 To ſay that Clerks ought voluntarily to ſubiect themſelues to the Lawes and Gouernments of Magiſtrates, but if they do otherwiſe, that they may not be puniſhed by the Magiſtrate, is as much as if a man ſhould ſay, that lawes are no lawes to them. A law without puniſhments added thereunto, is onely a councell. It is a commandement with a condition to do nothing vnleſſe we will our ſelues. Men ordinarily diſobey lawes, notwithſtanding preſcribed puniſhments: how much more then they will diſobey them when they feare not to be puniſhed?

Of the Popes power ouer the Crownes and liues of Kings and Princes, and ouer all the temporalties of kingdomes.

Sect. 40. Popes for the ſpace of 550. yeeres, haue attributed power vnto themſelues to diſpoſſeſſe Emperours & Kings of their kingdomes, and to diſpence with their ſubiects from keeping and obſeruing their oathes of fidelirie to their Princes, and to haue power both ouer ſpirituall and temporall Magiſtrates.

Gregory the 7. [a] firſt drew out this ſword againſt the Emperour *Henry* the 4. whom he depoſed from the Empire, but to his owne hurt, and his to whom he transfered the Empire, that was *Rodulphus* Duke of Sweueland, that died of a wound giuen him in his hand, and *Gregory* being driuen out of Rome, for griefe thereof died at Salerne.

[a] *Platina, Helmodus, Abbas Stadenſis, Vſpergenſis, Sigonius, Faſciculus temporum, Sigibertus, Nauclerus, Languinus, &c.*

[a] Anno 1212. *Innocent* 3. [b] depoſed *Iohn* King of England, and gaue his realme to *Philip Auguſtus* king of France, vpon [c] condition to conquer it at his owne coſt and perill. After that he abſolued the ſaid King *Iohn*, vpon condition that he ſhould become the Popes vaſſall, and hold his kingdome in fee of the Church of Rome, and that he ſhould yeerely pay a thouſand markes of ſiluer in ſigne of ſubiection.

[b] *Mat. Paris p.* 215. & 223. & *Weſtmonaſterienſis.*

The Councell of Latran holden *anno* 1215. vnder the ſame Pope,

Pope, in the third Chapter, * giueth the Pope power to absolue subiects of their oathes of fidelitie made vnto their Lords, and to giue their lands to other Catholicke Princes.

* *Significat tur hoc summo Pontifici, vt ex tunc ipse vasallos, ab eius fidelitate denunciet absolutos, & terram exponat occupandam.*

Anno 1191. as *Baronius* declareth, the Emperour *Henry* the sixth came to Pope *Celestine* the third, and fell downe at his feete. At which time the Pope with his foote spurned the Emperours Crowne from off his head, to shew, that it was in his power to take the Empire from him, and to pull off his Crow[illegible]

Anno [illegible]5. *Inno[illegible]* the 4. in an open Councell holden in Lions, deposed the Emperour *Fredericke* the second, and would neuer accept of any submission nor reconciliation. And since *Gregory* the 7. vntill *Lewis* of Bauiere, to whom the Empire entirely fell, for the space of 260 yeeres there was nothing but deposing and excommunicating of Emperours, vnlesse it were those that maintaind themselues by force, from whēce, ensued infinite bloudy warres, more then an hundred maine battels, and an innumerable number of townes taken and sacked.

Anno 1302. Pope *Boniface* the 8. wrote arrogant letters to *Philip* the Faire, King of France, whereby he declared that King *Philip* was subiect vnto him in temporall things: that no collation of Benefices belonged vnto him, and that all those that spake against it were heretickes. And resistance being made by *Philip*, the Pope gaue his kingdome to the Emperour *Albertus*, vpon condition to conquer it. What answer *Philip* the Faire made, and how he reuenged himselfe, euery man knowes.

See Paulus Æmilius and Nicolas Giles.

Anno 1511. Pope *Iulius* the second deposed *John* e *Albert* King of Nauarre, and gaue his kingdome to *Ferdinand* King of Castile, who seized vpon it, and his successors still hold it. Our good King *Lewis* the 12. was likewise thundred at, but he ouerthrew the Pope and his adherents in a battell at Rauenna; and at Pisa assembled a Councell against the Pope, causing certaine Crownes of gold to be stamped with this superscription, *Perdam nomen Babylonis.*

Alexander the sixt gaue the West-Indies to the Spaniards,

and

and the East Indies to the Portugals, placing the Meridian which passeth by the Azores, for their limits.

Sanderus & alij plerique nobiles Catholici freti Bulla Pij Quinti in Hibernia contra Angliæ Reginam bella pro patria & religione gerunt.

Pope *Pius* the 5. pronounced a sentence of degradation and deposition against *Elizabeth* Queene of England, and caused Ireland to rebell against her, as *Genebrard* writeth, *an.* 1581. of his Chronicle, saying, *Sanders and other Catholickes warranted by a bull made by Pope Pius the fifth, made warre in Ireland against the Queene, for their Countrey and for religion.*

With the like iniustice *Henry* the third King of France, having beene deposed by *Sixtus* the fifth and excommunicated, was not long after killed by *Iaques Clement* a Iacobin.

Anno 1592 monitorie Buls were sent from Rome by Pope *Gregory* the 14. into France, whereby King *Henry* the fourth was declared incapable of the Crowne of France; which Buls (by a Decree made by the Court of Parliament then resident in Tours bearing date the 5. of August,) were torne in pieces and burnt by the hand of the common executioner.

The Pope pretends that he may depose soueraigne Princes for heresie, as he pretended against Queene *Elizabeth*, and *Henry* the fourth, late King of France deceased; Or for being vpholders of heretickes, as *Henry* the third: Or for want of capacity, and weaknesse of spirit. So Pope *Zacharie* in the Canon *Alius*, in the 15. Cause and 6. question, boasteth, that he deposed *Childeric* for incapacity, and translated his kingdome to *Pepin*. Or for violating the priuiledges of Monasteries, as it is declared in the pretended priuiledge of the Abbey of Saint *Medard* in Soissons, which is added to the end of the works of Pope *Gregory* the first. Or for attributing vnto themselues the collation of Prebends and Benefices, which was the cause for which Pope *Boniface* the eight put downe *Philip* the Faire, & gaue his Realme to *Albertus* the Emperour.

Theodoret lib. 2 hist. cap. 16.

By this meanes affaires haue been much altered: for before this vsurpation, Emperours deposed and punished Popes, as subiects to their Empire.

The Emperour *Constantius*, sonne to *Constantine* the Great, drane *Liberius* Bishop of Rome, out of Rome, and banished him to Beroe, and put *Felix* in his place, giuing *Liberius* fiue hundred

hundred crownes to maintaine himselfe in his banishment.

Anno 420. the Emperour *Honorius* draue *Boniface* and *Eulalius* competitors for the Bishopricke, out of Rome, and not long after called *Boniface* thither againe.

Theodorick a Goth, King of Italie, sent *Iohn* Bishop of Rome Embassador to the Emperour *Iustinian*, & after calling him home, caused him to die in prison. Platina. Sigebert.

Belizarius Lieutenant to the Emperour *Iustinian*, anno 538. draue *Siluerius* Bishop of Rome out of Rome, and set *Vigilius* in his place, who by the Emperour *Iustinians* commandement came to Constantinople, where he was honorably receiued, but not long after, the Emperour being offended with his bold speeches, made him to be beaten till he was almost dead, and to be drawne with a rope about his necke thorow the Citie like a thiefe, as *Platina* reciteth. The things following are recited by *Nicephorus* in his 16. booke, and 17. Chapter. *Liberati Breuiarium.*

Anno 654. the Emperour *Constantius* caused Pope *Martin* to be bound in chaines, and banished him to Cherſona, where he died.

In the times of these Emperours the Popes payed 20. crownes for their inuestitures to the Emperour as to their Prince, as we may see by *Iustinians* Authenticke 123. cap. 3. The Emperour *Constantine le Barbu* released this tribute to Pope *Agathon*, anno. 679.

And since the Emperours of Constantinople lost Italie, the successors of *Charles* the Great draue away and punished diuers Popes. Anno 963. the Emperour *Othon* drane *Iohn* the 13. out of the Papacie. Anno. 1007. *Henrie* the second deposed 3. Popes, *Benet* 9. *Sylueſter* 3. and *Gregorie* the 6. whom *Platina* calleth *three horrible monsters.*

From these excommunications & degradations of Kings, spring the enterprises against their liues. The excommunication sent out against *Elizabeth* Queene of England was seconded by many conspiracies against her life. From the deposition of *Henrie* the 3. by *Sixtus* 5. ensued the parricide

committed by *Iacques Clement*, for the which the ſaid Pope gaue thankes to God in open Conſiſtorie. His Oration was put in print by our aduerſaries. And the Ieſuite *Mariana* extolleth that fact as an heroicall act, worthy of great commendation. *Bellarmine* openly approueth ſuch murthers of Kings in the 7. Chapter of his booke againſt *Barkley*, ſaying, *The Popes were wont to abſolue their ſubiects of their oathes of fidelitie, and, if need were, to deprive them of their regall authoritie, touching the execution it belongeth to others.* [a] And the Ieſuite *Suarez* in the 4. Chapter of his 6. booke againſt the King of great Brittaine, ſaith, *If the Pope depoſeth a King, he may not be driuen away nor killed, but by thoſe to whom the Pope ſhall giue order to do it.* But if the Pope depoſeth a King without giuing expreſſe commiſſion to kill him, *in that caſe* (he ſaith) *it belongeth onely to his lawfull ſucceſſor, if he be a Catholicke, or if he will not do it, it belongs to the common people to do it.* And generally all our aduerſaries that write in the defence of the Popes power ouer the Crownes and temporall iuriſdictions of Kings, [b] as *Bellarmine*, *Becanus*, *Francis de Verona*, *Suarez*, *Ribadinera*, *Gretzer*, *Eudamon-Iohannes*, and *Emanuel Sa*, *&c.* alledge the example of Queene *Athalia*, depoſed and ſlaine by the commandement of *Ioiada* the high Prieſt, and maintaine that the Pope hath the ſame power. Therefore the iudgement of the Court of Parliament of Paris pronounced againſt *Iohn Chaſtel*, that condemned this doctrine to be hereticall, and tending to the ſubuerſion of kingdomes, was cenſured at Rome; to the which cenſure was ioyned the ſtorie of the late Preſident of Thou, and of certaine bookes of *Mariana*, wherein he ſpeaketh of monies, without once mentioning the booke which he wrote of the inſtitution of a King, in the which the murther of Kings is approued. [c] Neuertheleſſe with this moderation, that it is better to poyſon a Tyrant in his chaire or in his clothes, (therein imitating the Kings of the Moores) then to poyſon his drinke or his meate, leſt that Tyrant ſhould be culpable of killing himſelfe, and that ſo it might be preiudiciall to his ſaluation. For with a great example of humanitie or mercie theſe fathers haue

This Oration was printed at Paris by *Nicolas Nivelle*, and *Rollin Thierri*, with approbation of three Doctors, *Boucher*, *de Creil*, and *Anselin*.

[a] *Si Papa regem deponat, ab illis tantum poterit expelli vel interfici quibus ipſe id commiſerit.* b 2. of King chap. 11.

[c] *Hoc tamen temperamento vti in hac quidem diſputatione licebit, ſi non ipſe qui perimitur venenum hauire cogatur, quo intimis medullis concepto pereat. Sed exterius ab alio adhibeatur, nihil adiuuante eo qui perimendus eſt, nimirum, cum tanta vis eſt veneni, vt ſella coaut ve le delibuta vim interficiendi habeat.*

haue a care of the ſoules of thoſe whoſe bodies they cauſe to be killed.

To ſupport this bloudy doctrine, they note certaine maximes of diuelliſh diuinitie,[d] As that it is better to ſuffer a King to be ſlaine, then to reueale a confeſſion: That the Pope may diſpenſe with the accompliſhing of an oath made to God: [e] That the Lord gaue to Saint *Peter*, and by conſequence to the Pope, power to make that which is no ſinne, to be ſinne, and that which is ſinne, to be no ſinne, which is Cardinall *Bellarmines* maxime in his booke againſt *Barkley*, cap. 31. That to kill a King that is depoſed, is not to kill a King, but a particular perſon: [f] That being taken, it is lawfull to vſe equiuocations before a Iudge to eſcape puniſhment: That a religious perſon ought to obey his Superiour with a blind obedience, that is, without iudging whether it be good or euill: That a man muſt not keepe faith and promiſe with one that is excommunicated: That he is not a murtherer that killeth an excommunicated perſon, as Pope *Urban* ſaith in the 23. Cauſe and 5. queſtion: [g] *Weeſteeme them not to be murtherers, who being poſſeſſed with zeale towards our mother the Catholicke Church againſt thoſe that are excommunicated, ſhall chance to kill any of them*: [h] That the ſentences, decrees, and iudgements of Iudges that are excommunicated, are voide and of no authoritie: That the Pope either directly or indirectly is Lord of all the temporall poſſeſſions of kingdomes: That being Paſtor, he may ſhut vp and deſtroy furious Rams, that is, Kings which are not obedient vnto him: [i] And alſo that he hath power ouer infidell and Pagan Kings, although for certaine conſiderations he doth not vſe that power. Theſe are propoſitions whereof the writings of the Ieſuites are full, & which the Ieſuites of France haue oftentimes bene moued & ſolicited to condemne, and to write againſt them, but neuer could be induced thereunto.

Some, (as the Cardinall *du Perron* in his oration made to

d *Eudæmon. in Apol. Garneti. c. 13. & Suarez tract. 2. de Pœnitentia. Nullum tantum poteſt eſſe malum, cuius vitandi cauſa confeſſionem prodere liceat.*

e *Bellarmin. in Barklaium cap. 13. in bonoſenſu Chriſtus dedit Petro poteſtatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum, de non peccato peccatum* Toletus lib. 4. de Inſtruct. ſacerdotali cap. 58

g *Canone excommunicatorum. Non enim eos homicidas arbitramur quos aduerſus excommunicatos, zelo matris Catholicæ Eccleſiæ ardenter, aliquos eorum trucidaſſe contigerit.*

h *Toletus lib. 1. de Inſtitutione Sacerdotali, cap. 13. Excommunicatus non poteſt exercere actum iuriſdictionis abſque publicatione excommunicatio facta, ſententiæ nulle ſunt.*

i *Bellarmin. in Barkl. cap. 21.*

the States in Paris vpon the 15. of Ianuarie, 1615.) do not finde it good that Kings ſhould be killed, but allow that the Pope ſhould depoſe them: which is all one; for, to pronounce the ſentence of depoſing againſt a King, is as much as to condemne him to dye, becauſe (as they ſay) from the time of his depoſing he his no more a lawfull King, but is held to be an vſurper. Now euery vſurper of a kingdom may iuſtly be killed. *In reos Maieſtatis & publicos hoſtes, omnis homo miles eſt*: ſo ſaith *Tertullian*. Take from a King the title of a lawfull King, and you take that from him which is the defēce of his life, which may eaſily be taken from him by euery man that is careleſſe of his owne life. Adde hereunto, that euery King which is depoſed, ſeeketh meanes to vphold his honour, to retaine the gouernement of his Countrie, and to defend himſelfe againſt thoſe that make any attēpt againſt his Crowne. In this publicke confuſion the King incurreth a thouſand dangers, and expoſeth his perſon to the hazards of warre. And there are not many ſoueraigne Princes foūd that haue ſuruiued in their Empires, or haue preſerued their liues, when they loſt their Crownes. For a King is ſet in an high place, from whence he deſcendeth not by degrees, but falleth downe headlong. And he that diſpoſſeſſeth him, goeth againſt all rules of humane wiſdome, if he ſuffreth him to liue whom he hath deprined of the Empire, who without doubt will ſeeke to lay hold vpon that which he hath loſt. Then whoſoeuer he be that will not haue Kings killed, but will haue them depoſed, ſpeakes as if he ſhould ſay, Let vs not kill them, but let vs diſarme them that they may be killed. Let vs not take their liues from them, but let vs take the meanes from them to ſaue their liues. Let vs not kill him while he is a King, but let vs depoſe him: for by that meanes, he that ſhall kill him, ſhall not kill a King. Theſe things are full of contradictions, and are very weakely ſet together: As the King of Great Britaine hath excellently well ſhewed in his Declaration againſt the ſaid Cardinall, whereby he did that to the ſaid Prelate, which the Pope doth to the new Cardinals the firſt day of their ſitting in Conſiſtorie;* at which time the Pope ſtoppeth their mouthes; but herein

*Looke touching this ceremonie the 1. booke of Sacred Ceremonies, Sect. 9.

herein is the difference, that the Pope openeth their mouthes againe at the next Consistorie following, but that great and wise King stopt the Cardinals mouth ** for euer, and in that matter put him to perpetuall silence. He did sufficiently condemne himselfe in his Oration, by saying, that for the same cause he was readie to suffer martyrdome; and yet it is a question not decided by the Scripture, nor by any Councels, and the Pope himselfe suffereth it to be accounted (Problematicall, (that is to say, doubtfull and vncertaine:) from whence it followeth, that the martyrdome which one should suffer for such a cause, would be problematicall and vncertaine.

** Note that the said Cardinall liued three yeeres and a halfe after the publication of the King of great Brittans book * *Cap.* 31. *Quod autem dicit iniustam sententiam non ledere eum in quem fertur, verum est quando is in quem fertur, eam humiliter tolerat & obseruat, donec iniustitia vel potius nullitas manifesté se prodat. Cap.* 17. *Si fortè Princeps spiritualis abutatur potestate sua iniustè excommunicando Principem temporalem, vel eius subditos siue iusta causa ab eius obedientia absoluendo, peccabit Princeps spiritualis, sed non poterit tamen Princeps sibi sumere iudicium de spiritualibus rebus, aut spiritualem Principem iudicare.*

But that which is most hard and intolerable in this matter, is, that our aduersaries confesse that the Pope may erre in his iudgement, and depose an innocent King: and * yet they will haue that King which is so vniustly condemned, to be peaceable, and not to contend, but to leaue his kingdome, and to stay till the iustice of his cause shall be tried. It is *Bellarmines* speech in the 17. and 31. Chapters of his book against *Barkley*. For he presupposeth that the new King that shall haue seized vpon the kingdome, will not put the deposed King to death, but finding him to be innocent, will receiue him againe, & reestablish him in his kingdome. What is this, but as much as if a man should spit in Kings faces, and leade them about like buffons, by adding euident laughter and mockerie to iniustice?

To support this doctrine, which trampleth vpon the maiestie of God in the persons of his anointed and his Lieutenants, our aduersaries gather together a great number of places in the Scripture, as first, the Lord said to S. *Peter, Feede my sheepe*: Therefore the Pope may thrust Kings out of their thrones. And Saint *Peter* saying, *Here are two swords*, the Lord said, *It is enough*. And God said to *Ieremie*, 1. Cha. 10. verse, *I haue this day set thee ouer the nations and ouer the kingdomes*. And Saint *Paul* said, 1. Cor. 2. 15. *The spirituall man iudgeth all things*: this spirituall man is the Pope. And God said to Saint *Peter, Whatsoeuer thou vnbindest on earth, shal be vnbound in heauen.*

uen. Therefore the Pope may diſcharge ſubiects of their ſubiection which they owe to their Prince. In the beginning of Geneſis it is ſaid, that *In the beginning God made heauen and earth.* It is *in principio*, and not *in principiis*, to ſhew that there is but one beginning, which is the Pope. Theſe are of priuate vſe, *All things are giuen vnto me of my Father*, Matthew 11. 27. And *All power is giuen vnto me in heauen and in earth*, Matth. 28. 18. And the diuels ſaid, *If thou wilt caſt vs out, ſend vs into the ſwine, that we may enter into them*, Mark. 5. 12. By this the Pope may diſpoſe of temporall kingdomes. For it is ſaid, Iohn 12. 31. *And I, if I be liſted vp from the earth, will draw all men vnto me.* Therefore the Pope being exalted, ought to draw all temporalties to himſelfe. And ſee other places which are hard to be anſwered: Ieſus Chriſt ſaid to *Peter*, *Put forth into the ſea, and caſt out the nets.* And he ſaith, Luk. 19. 30. *You ſhall finde a colt tyed whereon neuer man ſate, looſe him and bring him hither.* S. *Paul* 1. Cor. 9. ſaith *Haue we not power to eate and to drinke?* *Ergo*, the Pope may diſpoſe of all temporall things, and put Kings from their thrones. With ſuch places of Scripture the Popes and their Champions eſtabliſh their Empire. Time is too precious to ſtand long to confute theſe childiſh prooſes, which are not fit to be propoſed but with the ſword in hand. To propoſe theſe things, is to refute them, and it is not credible that any man will receiue or allow of theſe prooſes, but he that willingly will be deceiued.

Cardinall *du Perron* was aſhamed of ſuch allegations, and would not produce them in his Oration, but he alledged others which were no better then they. He ſaid that the Prophet *Samuel* depoſed King *Saul*: that the Prophet *Ahia* depoſed King *Roboam*: That *Azarias* the high Prieſt draue King *Oſias* from the gouernement of the Realme: that S. *Paul* ſaid to the Corinthians, that it is a ſhame for Chriſtians to be iudged by Iudges that are infidels. All which allegations are falſe, and by the Kings Maieſtie of great Britaine are manifeſtly and clearely confuted.

That this power of the Pope ouer the Crownes of Kings, and ouer the temporalties of kingdomes, is contrary to the Word of God, and to all reason.

1. In this point if we will beleeue and giue credit to the Scriptures, the controuersie is ended. There were many idolatrous Kings in Iudæa, as *Achas* and *Manasses*, against whom the high Priests did not pronounce any sentence of depositiō. 41. Sect.

2 The Prophet Ieremie 27.12. saith, *Bring your neckes vnder the yoke of the King of Babylon, and serue him and his people, and liue.* He will haue the Iewes to serue a Pagan King, as established by God. Conformable to that which *Daniel* 2. 37 saith, speaking of the same King, *Thou, ô King, art a King of Kings, for the God of heauen hath giuen thee a kingdome, power, and strength, and glorie.*

Nero was a monster in nature, the shame of humane kind, and the first Emperour that began to persecute the Church. Neuertheless the Apostle Saint *Paul*, Rom. 13. speaking of that power which then was in being, saith, that it was ordained by God, and that whosoeuer resisted the same, resisted the ordinance of God. Cardinal *du Perron* in his Oration seemeth to perswade, that this commandement was but by prouision and for a time. Which is a meanes to auoide all the commandements of God, and to dispence with them whē he will. He should at least haue shewed how long that prouisionall commandement continued, and at what time it began to bind mens consciences no more. This doth wrong the ancient Christians, and bereaueth their sufferings of the title of martyrdome, seeing that by his assertion they yeelded to the violence of Pagan Princes, not to obey a necessarie and certaine commandement of God, but a prouisional rule, made for a time, till the Church hauing recouered force by multitude of people, might shake off the yoke of their soueraigne Prince. And thereby the Apostle is accused of hypocrisie, for teaching Christians to faine and dissemble, commanding them to be subiects to the Emperour, not thereby to obey God, but to accommodate themselues to the time,

and to yeeld to preſent neceſſitie. All this is confuted by the ſame Apoſtle in the ſame place, where he ſaith, That we muſt be ſubiect to the Prince, not onely becauſe of wrath, that is, for feare to incur his diſpleaſure, but alſo for conſcience ſake.

Compare Ieſus Chriſt paying tribute to *Cæſar*, with the Pope which maketh *Cæſar* pay tribute vnto him, and bindeth * him to lay a quantitie of gold at his holineſſe feete, that day when he ſetteth the Crowne vpon his head. Compare Ieſus Chriſt counſelling the Iewes to pay tribute to a Pagan Emperour, with the Pope that diſpenſeth with ſubiects touching their obedience to Chriſtian Emperours and Kings: And Ieſus Chriſt, ſaying, that his kingdom is not of this world, with the Pope which hath erected a worldly Empire for himſelfe. Compare Ieſus Chriſt, who being on earth, had power to deſtroy and ouerthrow all Monarchs of the earth that were enemies to God, but would not do it, with the Pope, that hath no power to giue nor to take away kingdomes, but yet will do it, and attributeth a power vnto himſelfe which he cannot execute: And Ieſus Chriſt refuſing to be arbitrator in a controuerſie for an heritage betweene two particular perſons, with the Pope, which intrudeth himſelfe to be Soueraigne and abſolute Iudge of quarels betweene Princes, and diſtributer of kingdomes.

* This ceremonie is deſcribed in the 1. booke of Sacred Ceremonies, Sect. 5. cap. 3.

Luke 12. 14.

Adde to this the rule of the word of God which forbiddeth periurie, and will haue vs to keep our promiſe, although it be vnto our owne hinderance. To the which commandement it is better to obey, then to the Pope, that boaſteth that he can diſpence with oathes made vnto God: wherein he doth manifeſtly exalt himſelfe aboue God. For he that can dipenſe with a ſeruant for obeying of his maſter, is greater then his maſter. And hereby it will be found, that God ſhall not be ſerued nor obeyed, but in ſuch manner as the Pope will permit, and that if by the Popes permiſſion any man be faithfull towards God, God is beholding to the Pope, becauſe he prouideth him ſeruants, and ſuch perſons as are faithfull vnto him. Therefore to obey God, thoſe Officers, who at the entrance into their offices tooke oathes of fidelity to their

Exod. 20. Pſal. 15.

Kings,

Kings, muſt be faithfull to the Pope, what thunderings and inducements ſoeuer to rebellion ſhall happen to come from Rome to ouerthrow the Realme. If they reply & ſay, that by ſuffering a King that is an hereticke to reigne, Catholicke religion incurreth great danger: I anſwer, that oftentimes the Pope taketh on him to depoſe Kings that are of his owne religion. Was it for hereſie that *Henry* the 3. King of France was depoſed? Was it for hereſie that *Iohn Albert* King of Nauarre was diſpoſſeſſed and depriued of his kingdome by *Iulius* 2? & ſo of the Emperours *Henrie* the 4. and *Fredericke* the 2. and of *Philip le Bel*, and *Iohn* King of England, & diuers others? And although true religion ſhould be perſecuted by a King that is an hereticke, yet we muſt not remedie an euill by a ſinne, nor defend pietie by diſloyaltie. God hath no need of our vices to defend his cauſe. The preſeruation of true Religion is Gods cauſe, and his worke, which he will not abandon nor forſake. When humane meanes ſeeme to faile and decay, he watcheth and taketh care for the preſeruation of his Church; and if he will afflict it, we muſt humble our ſelues, and when he will deliuer it from danger, we neede not bring periurie and ſedition to ayde him, as if he had no other meanes to do it.

This alſo paſſeth all abſurditie, to imagine that Saint *Peter* and the Biſhops of Rome after him, had power to depoſe the Emperour *Nero* or *Domitian*. Without doubt thoſe Emperours that knew not that there was a Chriſtian Biſhop in Rome (ſo poore and miſerable were the ſaid Biſhops) are excuſable for not acknowledging and honouring thoſe Biſhops as their ſuperiours in temporall things, and who had power to thruſt them out of their Empires.

But why did not thoſe Biſhops aduertiſe the Emperours of the authority which they had ouer Empires, that ſo the Emperours might not pretend cauſe of ignorance? Why did not the Biſhop of Rome depoſe thoſe Emperours, when they violently perſecuted the Church? Was it becauſe they would vſe courteſie and clemencie vnto thoſe poore Emperours? But that clemencie had bene crueltie towards the Church. Was it becauſe they feared the power of thoſe Empe-

Emperours? So it may be ſayd, that the obedience which they yeelded to their ſoueraigne Prince, was done by diſſimulation and by force. Adde hereunto that *Tertullian* in the 37. Chapter of his Apologie, and *Cyprian* againſt *Demetrius*, ſay, that in their times euery place was full of Chriſtiãs that were able to defend themſelues, and that they held the greateſt part of the Empire of Rome, and yet did not defend themſelues againſt the violence of thoſe Emperours. In the time of the Emperour *Iuliã* the Apoſtata, three parts of the Empire were Chriſtians, and his armies were compoſed of Chriſtians, and yet the Biſhop of Rome did not thinke vpon depoſing him from the Empire. The ſame Biſhop alſo did not pronounce ſentence of depoſition againſt the Kings of the Gothes that were Arrians, reigning in Spaine, nor againſt the Kings of the Vandals that were Arrians, reigning in Africa; although they were farre diſtant from Rome, and that the Biſhop of Rome had no cauſe to feare their forces.

Who will beleeue that Ieſus Chriſt gaue Saint *Peter* and his ſucceſſors a charge for ſo many yeeres together, without power to execute it? and that he gaue them a ſword to hang vp a thouſand yeeres together againſt the wall, and neuer to be drawne out but of late yeeres? Is it credible, that the Popes began firſt to know the nature of their charge, then when their Sea or ſeate fell into all mãner of vices, as the greateſt flatterers of the Pope confeſſe, and acknowledge? Seeing alſo it is euident and knowne by experience, that the Pope neuer began to employ that power, but for his owne profit: and thereby increaſed in riches and greatneſſe, neuer giuing any abſolution to a Prince, but vpon gainfull conditions for the Pope, as he did to *Henrie* the ſecond, and *Iohn*, Kings of England. But when his thunderbolts cannot preuaile, and that the excommunicated King getteth the victorie, then his Holineſſe with paternall compaſſion receiueth him into his fauour, and beſtoweth all maner of ſpirituall benedictions vpon him. As Pope *Clement* the 5. in the Extrauagant *Meruit* did, where he commendeth and exalteth the pietie of *Philip* the Faire and of his people, notwithſtanding the

hard

hard vſage ſhewed vnto him by *Beniface* the eight his predeceſſor.

It is no leſſe incredible, that if a Pagan Prince becommeth a Chriſtian (as *Clouis* King of France did) he ſhould haue leſſe kingly authoritie then when he was a Pagan; and that his conuerſion to the faith, ſhould be a diminiſhing of his power. Yet that is the opiniõ of the Pope & the Ieſuites. For it is out of doubt, that *Clouis* being a Pagan, did not acknowledge the Biſhop of Rome for his ſuperiour, or that there was any Biſhop either within or without his kingdome, that could depoſe him of his Crowne. And if the Pope may change and depoſe Chriſtian Kings, it followeth that *Clouis* Crowne vpon the day of his conuerſion loſt the ſplendor & ſoueraigne dependance thereof, and began to be in the diſpoſition of another, and that then he began to acknowledge a Superiour in temporall things: which is, to be a Soueraigne no more. By this doctrine it will be hard to perſwade a Pagan Prince to become a Chriſtian.

But what reaſon is there, that Kings ſhould be more ſubiect to the Pope then their ſubiects are? and that Kings ſhould be hardlier dealt withall then particular perſons? For if a ſubiect of France ſhall erre in the faith, or commit adulterie, or vſe his ſeruants tyrannouſly, the Pope neuer to this day durſt vndertake to driue him from his houſe, or to depriue him of his office; then why ſhould a King falling into the like faults, be hardlier dealt withall? Why ſhould the Pope haue more power ouer him then ouer other particular men, depriuing him of his Crowne, and by conſequence of his life? Is it becauſe the Pope thinketh that our Kings haue leſſe ſpirit or leſſe courage then particular perſons? Or rather, becauſe the Pope abuſing Kings in that manner, raiſeth himſelfe to ſoueraigne greatneſſe, and becommeth thereby diſtributer of Empires and kingdomes?

We haue ſomewhat largely ſpoken of this ſubiect, that euery man may ſee whether *M. Arnoux* hath reaſon to ſpeake of vs as of men that repugne all humane order, and are enemies of al ſubiection. Our Confeſſion proteſteth the contrary,

and

and experience iustifieth vs. We neuer attempted any thing against the liues of our Kings. *Iaques Clement*, *Iohn Chastell*, *Ranaillac*, *Garnet*, *Oldcorne*, and such monsters, and all those who hauing sought to kill the King, and fained madnesse to saue themselues, were not of our religion: but the most part of them were Iesuites or Iesuites disciples. We neuer spake of deposing our Kings, neither beleeue that any man liuing in the world can depose a King, or dispense with his subiects touching their oathes of fidelitie. And they that know the truth, wil acknowledge, that the reasō which hath moued the Pope and the Clergie to persecute vs with fire and sword, hath nor bene so much because we do not beleeue Transubstantiation, nor the sacrifice of the Masse, nor inuocation of Saints, as because if we might be beleeued, our Kings Crowne should no more depend vpon the Pope: and causes of benefices and of matrimony should no more be called to Rome, the Realme should be no more tributarie, vnder pretence of Annates, Dates, Dispensations, and Absolutions. And Frenchmen should run no more to Rome for pardons; whereby his Holinesse profits would much diminish. Which if we would not meddle withall, he would by speciall priuiledge suffer and permit vs to beleeue the Gospell.

Whether the power of Kings, Princes and Magistrates is ordained by the diuine Law of God, or whether it be an humane ordinance, as M. Arnoux saith.

Thomas the chiefe of the Schoolmen saith, that the power of Princes & soueraigne Lords, is but an humane institution, and proceedeth not from God. With whom Cardinal *Bellarmine* ioyneth in his booke against *Barkley*, and *M. Arnoux*, who vpon the 30. Article of our Confession, calleth the power of Magistrates *an humane law*; conformable to the Apophthegme of the reuerend father *Binet* the Iesuite, that said to

42. *Sect.* * *Thom. 2. 2. Quæst. 10. Art. 10. Dominium & prælatio introducta sunt ex iure humano. Et Quæst. 12. Art. 2. Dominium introductum est de iure gentium, quod est ius humanum.*

M.

M. Casaubon, that it were better that all Kings were killed, then to reueale a confession, * because the power of Kings is ordained by humane lawes, but confession by diuine law.

* *Casaub. in Epist. ad Frontonem Ducæum Iesuitam.*

The reasons which they alledge for this opinion, are, that the first King that was in the word, that is *Nimrod*, ** made himselfe King by force, and not by the ordinance of God. Secondly, that the greatest part of Empires and kingdomes that euer were, were erected by conquest, one nation hauing ouercome another, or one Prince moued by ambition, hauing moued an vniust quarrell against his neighbour Prince. Thirdly, that Emperours & Kings are established by humane meanes, whether they attaine to the Crowne by hereditarie succession or by election: seeing there is neither any extraordinarie reuelation, nor rule in the word of God, which bindeth a nation rather to follow hereditarie succession then election. Fourthly, that there is no expresse commãdement set downe by God to obey *Henrie* or *Lewis*, or to acknowledge this or that man more then another to be King. Fifthly, that for these considerations, the Apostle Saint *Peter* calleth the obedience to Kings an humane order, saying, *Submit your selues to euerie ordinance of man, for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as supreme, or vnto Gouernours, &c.* 1. Pet. 2. 13.

** *Gen.* 11.

We on the contrary maintaine, that obedience due to Kings and Magistrates, procedeth from the diuine Law, & is grounded vpon the ordinance of God. To that end all the places of Scripture hereafter set down do serue, to shew that God commandeth obedience to Kings and Soueraigne powers, as to those whom he hath established, whom no man may resist without resisting God. *There is no power but of God, the powers that be, are ordained of God: whosoeuer therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God*, Rom. 13. 1, 2. & verse 5. *Wherfore ye must needs be subiect, not onely for wrath, but also for conscience sake.* And S. *Peter* in the same place which they obiect against vs, will haue vs to yeeld obedience to Kings *for the Lords sake.* And although *Nabuchadnezzar* was an vngodly King, and a scourge vsed by God to destroy nations, neuertheless God speaketh thus vnto him by his Prophet *Daniel*, in Chap. 2. verse.

verſe 37. ſaying, *Thou, ô King, art a King of Kings, for the God of heauen hath giuen thee a kingdom, power, and ſtrength, and glory. Moſes* the firſt Prince and Law-giuer in Iſrael, was eſtabliſhed by the ordinance of God, and *Ioſhua* after him, Numb. 27 18. *Saul* firſt King of Iſrael, and *Dauid* his ſucceſſor were anointed by *Samuel*, and conſecrated to be Kings according to Gods ordinance. And 2. Kings 9.1, 2. God ſent a Prophet to *Iehu* to anoint him King of Iſrael. *He looſeth the bonds of Kings, and girdeth their loynes with a girdle*, Iob 12.18. *But God is the Iudge, he putteth downe one, and ſetteth vp another*, Pſal. 75.7. *He raiſeth the poore out of the duſt, and lifteth the needie out of the dunghill, that he may ſet him with Princes*, Pſal. 113.7,8. And if the prouidence of God extendeth it ſelfe ſo farre as to feede birds, and to giue foode to the yong rauens which crie vnto him, Pſalme 147.9. ſo farre as that he numbreth all our haires, ſo that not one falleth to the ground without his prouidence, who will beleeue that when a man is to be placed aboue others, and to be made head and ruler of ſo many millions of people, that the counſell and prouidence of God doth not therein rule, or that he ſuffreth things to be done by chance or at aduenture?

1. Sam. 10.1. and 16.13.

An anſwer to the 5. obiections of our aduerſaries.

The reaſons which they alledge againſt ſo euident a truth, halt, and flutter but with one wing.

1. They ſay, that *Nimrod* the firſt King in the world attained thereunto by force. But it is falſe, that before *Nimrod* there was no ſoueraigne Prince in the world. Before *Nimrod* the fathers and heads of families were Kings, Prieſts and ſoueraigne Princes of their families. For after the floud men liued 5. or 6. hundred yeeres. Then it was an eaſie matter for a man to ſee 50. yea an 100. thouſand perſons of his poſteritie, ouer whom he exerciſed paternall power, and by conſequence ſouereignitie, then, when there was no other forme of a kingdome vpon the earth; to whoſe children their ſeruants being added, one familie alone made a great commonwealth. Likewiſe in *Abrahams* time, whē mans life was much ſhortened, we reade that *Abraham* was by the Hethites called *a Prince of God*, that is, *an excellent Prince*, Geneſ. 23. 6. And that

that out of his familie he tooke 318. ſouldiers to go to warre therewith. If you adde his maid-ſeruants and ſuch ſeruants as were vnfit for the warre, you muſt confeſſe, that although he had no children, his familie would haue peopled a towne.

2. They alſo obiect, that the greateſt part of Empires and kingdomes began by conqueſt and by force of armes, therefore not by the ordinance of God; and that if the conqueror inuaded another mans territories by the ordinance of God, the inhabitants of that countrie had offended God in defending themſelues. Whereunto I ſay, that thoſe whoſe coũtries a ſtrange Prince ſeeketh to inuade, do well to defend themſelues. And that if in that defenſiue warre the vſurper chance to be ſlain, he his iuſtly puniſhed. But if he getteth the vpperhand, if the race of the ancient poſſeſſors of the ſame countrie be cleane extinguiſhed, if the States of the country aſſembled together, do agree vpon a new forme of gouernement, and if all the officers throughout the countrie haue taken their oathes of fidelitie to the new King: then we muſt beleeue that God hath eſtabliſhed ſuch a Prince in that kingdome. Then I ſay, that the people ought to yeeld to the will of God, who for the ſinnes of Kings and of their people tranſporteth kingdomes, and diſpoſeth of the iſſues of battels at his will and pleaſure.

3. It is to no purpoſe to ſay, that Princes enter into kingdomes, either by hereditary ſucceſſion, or by election, which are meanes introduced by cuſtome, & not by the ordinance of God. For the queſtion is not, by what meanes a Prince attaineth to his kingdome, but whether by the ordinance of God we ought to obey him after he is eſtabliſhed therein. But our aduerſaries will haue the power of Popes to proceed frõ the ordinance of God, although they enter into the Papacie by election, by indirect courſes, by artificial deuices, and by worſe meanes then humane wayes.

4. If there be no commandement in the word of God to obey *Henry* or *Lewis*, it ſufficeth that there is a commandement to obey the King, and a commandement to keepe our oathes of fidelitie made to the King, and by conſequence to

be.

be faithfull to that King to whom we ſweare obedience and loyaltie. Neither is there a commandement of God to be found, that binds vs to obey *Clement* or *Boniface* as Popes, to whom neuertheleſſe our aduerſaries eſteeme themſelues to be ſubiect by the Law of God. If this conſideration might take place, it would follow that no man in the world is bound by diuine ordinance to feare God, or to beleeue in Ieſus Chriſt, becauſe the Scripture doth not particularly ordaine that *Thomas*, *Anthony*, or *William* ſhould feare God, and beleeue in Ieſus Chriſt. It ſufficeth that the word of God containeth generall rules, which bind particular perſons without naming them.

5 It is true, that S. *Peter* in the place before alledged, calleth the obedience that men owe vnto Kings, an humane order, either becauſe Kings command diuers things which of their owne natures are not deriued frō the diuine Law, as the forbidding of knocking by night, or to go by night without a candle; or becauſe they attaine to that power by certaine humane meanes induced by cuſtome: which hinders not but that their power is groūded vpō the word of God after they are once eſtabliſhed. For in this queſtion our difference is not touching the meanes whereby a Prince attaineth to a kingdome, but what obedience is due vnto him after he hath attained thereunto. Therefore after S. *Peter* had called that order an humane order, he commandeth vs to ſubiect our ſelues thereunto *for Gods ſake*: and ſo to obey his commandement.

Whoſoeuer buildeth the authority of Kings vpon mens inſtitutions, and not vpon the ordinance of God, cutteth off thee parts of their authoritie, and bereaueth them of that which aſſureth their liues and their Crownes, more then the guards of their bodies, or puiſſant armies, which put terror into ſubiects hearts, in ſtead of framing them to obedience. Then the fidelity of ſubiects will be firme and ſure, when it ſhall be incorporated into pietie, and eſteemed to be a part of religion, and of the ſeruice which men owe vnto God.

FINIS.

A TABLE OF THE MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE FIRST BOOKE, ACCORDING to the order of the Sections.

Of the Apocrypha bookes, Sect. 1. pag. 3.

Of the testimony which the Church giueth of the Canonicall bookes, Sect. 5. p. 10.

What the beliefe of the ancient Church was touching these Canonicall bookes, and whether the Church be the infallible Iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, Sect. 6. p. 12.

Of particular inspiration to interpret the Scripture, Sect. 7. pag. 18.

Of the Interpretation of the Scripture, and whether the Church of Rome be the infallible Interpreter of the Scripture, and whether it belongeth to euery particular person to interpret the same. Sect. 9. p. 23.

Whether the Church may erre, and whether the Church of Rome hath erred, Sect. 10. p. 30.

Of the perfection of the Scriptures, and of Traditions, Sect. 13. 14. 15. p. 40.

The Iudgement of the ancient Fathers touching the perfection of the holy Scriptures, Sect. 16. p. 53

Of the authority of the Church, and whether she or the Scripture be the Iudge, and whether M. Arnoux hath reason to call the holy Scriptures a dumbe rule, Sect. 19. p. 57.

Whether the lips of the Priest do infallibly preserue knowledge, Sect. 20. p. 64.

Of the prouidence of God, and how God conducteth the actions of the wicked, without being author of sinne, or participating with their vices, Sect. 21. p. 69.

Of free-will, and of mans Conversion, Sect. 29. p.[illegible]
Whether man by his free-will can doe any good thing, Sect. 36. p.[illegible]
Of originall sinne after Baptisme, Sect. 39. p.[illegible]
Of the imputation of Adams transgression of Christ, Sect. 32. p.102
Of humane satisfactions, Sect. 36. p.110.
Of superabundant satisfactions, and whether the merits of Christ are applyed unto us by our satisfactions, Sect. 40. p.123.
Of Iustification by faith, and what the faith is, Sect. 42. p.127.
Of Iustification onely by faith, and of the word Iustifie, Sect. 43. p.132.
How according to Saint Iames, man is iustified by workes, Sect. 44. p.136.
Of the certainety of salvation and of perseverance, Sect. 46. p.137.
Whether a man is saved and elected, upon condition that he shall believe and do good workes, Sect. 47. p.142.
Of the feare of the faithfull, and whether it derogateth any thing from the certainety of salvation, Sect. 49. p.144.
Of certainety to persever, Sect. 50. p.147.
Whether faith can be with without good workes, Sect. 54. p.154.
Of the first and second iustification according to the Church of Rome, Sect. 61. p.159.
Of Merits, Sect. 62. p.160.
Whether God is debtor unto us, (as Mr. Arnoux saith) and of our reward, Sect. 68. 69. p.171.
Of works of supererogation, Sect. 70. p.173.
Of the Invocation of Saints, Sect. 71. p.181.
Whether the Saints understand our prayers, and know all that is done here upon the earth, Sect. 73. p.188.
Whether Iesus Christ be our onely mediator and advocate, Sect. 74. p.187.
That the Saints are not our advocates, and that the Church of Rome calleth upon some Saints that never were, and whose holinesse is very questionable, Sect. 75. p.191.
That the mutuall prayers of the living, make nothing for the Invocation of Saints dead, Sect. 76. p.196.
Of the credit of Saints in heaven, Sect. 77. p.197.
Proofe of the Invocation of Saints by Aristotle, Sect. 78. p.199.

Con-

Confutation of the inuocation of Saints by the Scriptures, Sect. 81. p. 201.
Confutation of the places of Scripture alleaged for the inuocation of Saints, Sect. 82. p. 207.
Of Purgatory, Sect. 84. p. 209.
The description of Purgatory, Sect. 85. p. 210.
The opinions of the ancient Fathers touching the state of the soules of the faithfull after this life, Sect. 86. p. 214.
Confirmation of Purgatory by the Word of God, Sect. 87. p. 220.
Placets of the Fathers against Purgatory, Sect. 88. p. 230.
Of Pardons, Sect. 89. p. 236.
Of single life, or perpetuall abstinence from marriage, Sect. 90. p. 239.
Of the difference of meates, Sect. 91. p. 253.
Of the word Church, and of the diuers significations thereof, Sect. 92. p. 262.
Whether the Church be visible, and to whom it is visible, Sect. 93. p. 267.
Of the true markes of the true Church, Sect. 94. p. 268.
Of the false markes of the Church, and of the title Catholicke, the first marke, Sect. 95. p. 272.
Of Antiquitie, the second marke, Sect. 95. p. 273.
Of succession of Churches, the third marke, Sect. 97. p. 274.
Of perpetuall continuance, the fourth marke, Sect. 98. p. 275.
Of multitude and greatnesse, the fifth marke, Sect. 99. p. 276.
Of miracles, the sixth marke, Sect. 100. p. 277.
Of vnitie, the seuenth marke, Sect. 101. p. 278.
Of the circle in disputation, Sect. 103. p. 280.
Againe of the Church and her markes. Sect. 104. 105. p. 282.
Markes whereby M. Arnoux will haue the true Church to be knowne, Sect. 105. p. 285.
Againe of the perpetuitie of the Church, Sect. 106. p. 288.
Of Libertinisme and prophane life, Sect. 110. p. 292.
Of Peters supremacie, Sect. 111. p. 295.
Of Peters successors, Sect. 114. p. 299.
Againe of the perpetuitie of the Church, Sect. 115. p. 302.
Of Idolatrie in the Romish Church, and in how many sorts the Church

Church of Rome is idolatrous, and what Idolatrie, Sect. 116. p.303.
Of the words Image and Idol, and of the Hebrew words Pesel and Temunah which God vseth in the Law, Sect. 117. p.305.
Of the Images of God and of the Trinitie, Sect. 118. p.307.
Whether it be lawfull to set vp pictures and images of Saints that are dead in the Churches, for lectures and furtherances of piety and deuotion, Sect. 119. p.312.
Of the adoration of Images, and of the seruice which is done vnto them, Sect. 120. p.315.
Of the adoration of the Crosse, & of the signe of the Crosse, Sect. 121. p.328.
Of Relicks, and of the adoration of them, Sect. 122. p.333
Confutation of the adoration of Relicks by the Word of God, Sect. 123. p.340.
Of the dominion of the Prelates of the Church of Rome, Sect. 124. p.344.
Against of Saint Peters supremacy, Sect. 129. p.350.
Of the vocation of Pastors, Sect. 130. p.353.
Against of the perpetuity and infallibleness of the Church of Rome, Sect. 132. p.362.
Of Ecclesiasticall policy, Sect. 136. p.366.
Of Excommunications of the Church of Rome, Sect. 136. p.369.

A Table of the matters contained in the second booke.

OF the pretended Sacrament of Confirmation, Sect. 2. p. 376
Of the Sacrament of Penance, Sect. 3. p.382.
Of Auricular Confession, Sect. 4. p.386.
Of Absolution and sacramentall satisfaction, Sect. 5. p.389.
Of the pretended sacrament of Marriage, Sect. 6. p.395.
Of extreme Vnction, Sect. 8. p.404.
Of the sacrament of Orders, Sect. 9. p.412.

Whether

Whether the order of Priesthood be a sacrament, Sect. 10. p.413.
Of the order of Priesthood in the Church of Rome, and of their sacrificing, Sect. 11. p.414.
Of the sacrifice of the Masse, Sect. 12. p.420.
Reasons which our aduersaries alledge for the sacrifice of the Masse, Sect. 13. p.429.
How and in what sense the holy Supper may be called a sacrifice, Sect. 14. p.437.
The opinions of the Fathers touching the sacrifice of the Eucharist, Sect. 15. p.439.
Of Baptisme and the necessitie thereof, Sect. 16. p.444.
The signification of the word Baptisme, Sect. 17. p.446.
Of the necessity of Baptisme in persons that are at yeeres of discretion, Sect. 18. p.447.
Of the necessitie of Baptisme of little children, Sect. 19. p.450.
The deciding of this question by the holy Scriptures, Sect. 20. p.453.
The examination of that which our aduersaries produce for the absolute necessitie of Baptisme, Sect. 21. p.458.
Of the reall vnion of the faithfull with Iesus Christ, and of the eating of his body, Sect. 22. p.463.
Of the reall presence, and of Transsubstantiation, Sect. 23. p.466.
The beliefe of both parts, Sect. 24. p.467.
Proofe of the doctrine of our Church by the words of the institution of this Sacrament, Sect. 25. p.470
Proofe of the same by the circumstances of the action, Sect. 26 p.484.
Other places of Scripture for the same matter, Sect. 27. p.487.
A briefe and certaine exposition of these words, This is my body, Sect. 28. p.491.
With what libertie our aduersaries forge figures, Sect. 29. p.494.
That Transsubstantiation abolisheth the humanity of Christ, and exposeth it to great opprobry and disgrace, Sect. 30. p.497.
That in the 6. of S. Iohn, there is nothing that maketh for Transsubstantiation, Sect. 31. p.502.
That the Masse, and the Decrees, and Glosses of the Church of Rome ouerthrow Transsubstantiation. Sect. 32. p.509.

Certaine places out of the Fathers concerning this subiect, Sect. 33. p. 513.
An answer to the Prosopopeia made by M. Arnoux, Sect. 34. p. 523.
Of taking the Cup away from the Laitie in the holy Supper, or of the Communion vnder one kind onely, Sect. 35. p. 525.
Examination of the aduersaries reasons, Sect. 36. p. 530.
Meanes of agreement, Sect. 37. p. 533.
Of the exemption of the Clergy, Sect. 39. p. 536.
Of the Popes power ouer the Crownes and liues of Kings, and ouer all the temporalties of Kingdomes, Sect. 40. p. 538.
That the Popes power ouer the Crownes of Kings, and ouer the temporalties of Kingdomes, is contrary to the Word of God and reason, Sect. 41. p. 542.
Whether the power of Kings, Princes, and Magistrates, be ordained by diuine Law, or whether it be an humane ordinance, as M. Arnoux alledgeth, Sect. 42. p. 556.

FINIS.